



WILEY SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES

EDITED BY

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

Professor of Sociology, New York University

IMMIGRANT
BACKGROUNDS

WILEY SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES

EDITED BY

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

PUBLISHED BY

JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC.

The Foundations of Social Life

By HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD. 279 pages. 5½ by 8. 8 figures. Cloth, \$2.75 net.

Immigrant Backgrounds

By HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD and Fifteen Contributors. 269 pages. 5½ by 8. Cloth, \$2.75 net.

Background of International Relations

By CHARLES HODGES, Assistant Professor of Government, New York University.

In Press. Ready, Summer, 1927.



IMMIGRANT BACKGROUNDS

BY

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

Professor of Sociology, New York University

EDITOR

CONTRIBUTORS

CHARLES A. BENNETT

J. MERLE DAVIS

S. DINGOL

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

KUNO FRANCKE

HENRY GODDARD LEACH

READ LEWIS

H. A. MILLER

A. W. PEZET

S. K. RATCLIFFE

JOSEPH REMENYI

BRUNO ROSELLI

ARTHUR RUHL

WILLIAM WOOD

FLORIAN ZNANIECKI

NEW YORK

JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC.

LONDON: CHAPMAN & HALL, LIMITED

1927

COPYRIGHT, 1927
By JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC.

325.73
I33i

Printed in U. S. A.

PRESS OF
BRAUNWORTH & CO., INC.
BOOK MANUFACTURERS
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

This book owes its existence to Alexander S. Massell. His was the original idea. His was the friendly persistence which turned this idea into a gad-fly that could not be ignored. His was the encouragement and wise counsel that helped to develop the volume in its present form.

To him grateful appreciation is amply due and is heartily tendered.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. WHAT IS AN IMMIGRANT BACKGROUND? . . .	I
By HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD	
II. THE BRITISH	14
By S. K. RATCLIFFE	
III. THE FRENCH-CANADIANS	27
By WILLIAM WOOD	
IV. THE GERMANS	42
By KUNO FRANCKE	
V. THE GREEKS	58
By HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD	
VI. THE HUNGARIANS	71
By JOSEPH REMENYI	
VII. THE IRISH	84
By CHARLES A. BENNETT	
VIII. THE ITALIANS	96
By BRUNO ROSELLI	
IX. THE JEWS	123
By S. DINGOL	
X. JUGO SLAVS AND CZECHOSLOVAKS	136
By HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER	
XI. THE LATIN-AMERICANS	151
By A. W. PEZET	

CHAPTER	PAGE
XII. THE ORIENTALS	180
By J. MERLE DAVIS	
XIII. THE POLES	196
By FLORIAN ZNANIECKI	
XIV. RUSSIANS AND BALTIC PEOPLES	212
By ARTHUR RUHL	
XV. THE SCANDINAVIANS	229
By HENRY GODDARD LEACH	
XVI. OTHER PEOPLES	242
By READ LEWIS	

IMMIGRANT BACKGROUNDS

CHAPTER I

WHAT IS AN IMMIGRANT BACKGROUND?

By HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD,

*Professor of Sociology, New York University; author of "Immigration"
and "The Melting Pot Mistake."*

THE central fact in immigration is the transfer from one social group to another. In all true immigration this transfer involves the crossing of a political boundary line. But the significance of this political factor may be, and very frequently is, greatly overestimated. In fact, the new political orientation is scarcely more than an incident in the problem that the typical immigrant has to face. He experiences a complete change in his environment, both human and physical, and political institutions form only a minor portion of this environment. It is the environment in its entirety which he has left behind that constitutes the background of the immigrant.

Anything, then, that tends to give coherence, unity, character, and self-consciousness to a human group is a part of the background of the immigrants who go

out from that group. All these factors taken together form the group environment. They may logically be divided into two great classes:

A. Factors in the physical environment.

B. Factors in the human environment.

The nature and importance of the physical environment have received much attention and exploitation recently, and are quite generally understood by all close students of human affairs. There can be no doubt as to the significance of the factors of topography, temperature, rainfall, winds, elevation, etc. as influences bearing upon migration, even to the extent of determining its possibility in extreme cases.

The role of the human environment, however, is much less well understood. It is both much more complex and much more important. It is, in fact, the significance of the social environment that more than anything else differentiates human groups from groups of the lower animals. Many of the lower animals are gregarious, but the group life is simple and rudimentary in the extreme, and the ties that bind the individual to his group are vague, ill-defined, and unspecialized. But among men, group life is very highly developed. The human individual must be nicely adapted not only to a physical environment but to a human environment. His life and health depend at least as much upon the latter as upon the former, and his happiness, and mental and spiritual well-being, much more.

The migrating human suffers two distinct detachments, and must effect two distinct readjustments.

He is torn away from both a physical and a social environment, and he must make adaptation to a new environment of each kind. The adaptation to a new physical environment is relatively easy for civilized man, especially when it is a better one. Science has equipped us with knowledge and devices that enable us, through changes in diet, clothing, hygienic régime, etc. to accommodate ourselves to almost any environment except the most extreme. Moreover, practically all modern immigration is between different sections of the temperate zones, so that physical accommodations are minimized. The problem of adjustment involved in immigration would be slight indeed if only physical adaptations were required. The real problem inheres in group differences and these may range between very remote extremes within similar climatic zones.

The most significant part, then, of an immigrant background consists in the characters of the human group within which he has passed his days up to the time of migration, and to which he is of necessity adapted. What are these group characters? They may be divided into two main categories:

A. Racial.

B. Cultural, or national.

The factor of race in human affairs is an extremely important one, and yet one exceedingly liable to misinterpretation and exaggeration. Race is a purely biological factor. It is a matter of physical kinship. A race is a group of men more closely related to each other in blood than they are to the members of other

racess, because their ancestry is more nearly identical. The races of man have been formed by the subdivision of the original human stock. The "genealogical tree" furnishes a remarkably apt illustration. Just as a tree starts from a single great trunk and subdivides into limbs, branches, boughs, and twigs, so the great primeval stream of human life has branched out into smaller and smaller subdivisions. The final stage of the process of race making is the family of brothers and sisters, all with exactly the same ancestry. Long before this point is reached, however, we cease calling the subdivisions races. If there had never been any possibility of cross-currents between these branches of the great human stock they would have remained perpetually separated from each other, and the racial situation would have been much simpler than it is today. In actual fact there has been an immeasurable amount of race mixing, so that the characteristics of races have become blended and confused. Nevertheless, there still remain many distinct groupings of human beings that are clearly racial; even some of the mixed races are well-defined, and have distinctive characters of their own.

The essential fact to grasp about race is that it is a matter of physical heredity, and hence not subject to human control. Each individual's race is determined by that of his parents. He has no power to alter his own racial traits (though he may partially conceal them, or modify their external exhibition) nor has he any influence over the racial traits that he will pass on to his descendants. He has no choice but to pass on what he has, or is. In one sense, therefore, race is strictly an

individual matter. That is to say, it is not in the least dependent upon the group in which one lives, nor can any change in group environment alter one's racial affiliations, though minor race traits may be lost sight of. Putting it in another way, the group influence of race is vertical, not horizontal. A great group of persons has been instrumental in determining the racial character of each one of us. But it is a group that runs backward chronologically through the generations of ancestors, not the environing group of contemporaries. Our race is determined for us at birth, and we carry it with us to the grave.

There are many different types of racial composition exhibited by the human groups that cover the earth's surface today. Consequently, the racial factor in the social background may be entirely different for different individual immigrants or bodies of immigrants. Certain human groups, such as the Icelanders and Danes are relatively pure racially, and hence have a unified race feeling, and virtually all the immigrants coming from them will have the same race as each other and as the group from which they come.¹ Other groups are mixed racially, but the mixture is homogeneous, that is, the bulk of the individuals have essentially the same racial elements in their composition. In such groups race feeling is likely to be almost as unified as among pure racial groups. Scotland and Portugal may serve as examples of this type. Still other groups are com-

¹ Though it must never be forgotten that every individual carries his race with him, and origin in a given group is never more than presumptive evidence as to the race of an immigrant.

posed of two or more different races or race mixtures, which remain distinct and to a certain extent socially isolated from each other. This is perhaps the commonest type, as it certainly is the most perplexing, among the groups that constitute the backgrounds of immigrants to America. Examples of this type are furnished by Ireland, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugoslavia, (The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes) and many others. In such cases it is the worst possible fallacy to treat group origin as an index of race. Many a crime, for example, has been charged up against the Turks because some person of a different race, haled before a police magistrate, has given his birthplace as Turkey.

The racial background affects an immigrant in two main ways:

- A. It determines fundamentally what he is.
- B. It profoundly influences the way he feels.

The extent to which racial affiliations determine the character of an immigrant depends, of course, upon the degree to which heredity, as contrasted with environment, makes any individual what he is. For race is heredity. This is a much debated question into which it would not be profitable to enter here. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, that the total effect is tremendous.

There can also be no doubt that race affects very deeply the feelings of the immigrant toward other groups than his own, and immigrants from those groups. Racial feeling—sympathy toward the in-group

and antipathy toward out-groups—is an immensely potent factor in human affairs. This is clearly illustrated by the sharp cleavages, based on racial grounds, that exist in many well-defined political units, such as the old Austro-Hungarian Empire or the modern states that have arisen out of it.

To understand the significance, therefore, of the racial factor in the background of any individual immigrant it is necessary to know his own racial affiliations, and the racial composition of the group from which he comes. Nothing could be more misleading than to lump together all immigrants who are called by the same name—Italians, Poles, Austrians, etc.—or who originate in the same foreign group, on the assumption that the racial considerations are necessarily identical for them all. It is the height of irony, for instance, to link together Armenians and Turks, in view of the way the two races feel toward each other.

The concept of true race is relatively simple, however difficult it may be to get at the facts in any particular case. The notion of culture, or nationality, on the other hand is much more complex and baffling. Culture, as has been pointed out, is distinctly a human achievement. Broadly stated, it represents and includes the methods worked out by various human groups to solve their life problems. Some of these methods have to do with the control of physical forces, the mastery of Nature. Others have to do with the establishment of contacts and relationships between the units of a human group. In practice, these become almost invariably closely intertwined.

The basic needs of human groups, or of individuals living in groups, are essentially the same the world over. Men are fundamentally much more alike than they are different. Every human being must have food, drink, and sleep; he must have such protection from the elements as his physical environment requires; he must mate if he is to contribute to the perpetuation of his species; he must gratify, if possible, his impulses of curiosity, play, and reverence; he must have from his group some degree of recognition and response. In like manner, every human group must have its economic system, its means of communication, its organs of government, its institutions for regulating the relations of the sexes. In every society, therefore, we look for the same types of institutions, or social products of various sorts.

But the ways in which particular societies have worked out these basic problems are as multifarious as humanity itself. No two societies on earth ever worked them all out in the same way; it is doubtful if any two societies ever independently worked out any single one of them in exactly the same way. When minor details are considered, the possible variations in folkways approach infinity. If human groups had always been completely insulated from each other so that there was no possibility of interchange of cultural influence (acculturation) there is no imagining how diversified their ways of life might have become. Even as it is, the differentiations between the mores of different groups, even though living in contact with each other, are very

marked. These differentiations eventually extend to the very ideals and philosophy of life itself.

Now the characteristic ways of life of a given group, representing as they do its accumulated life experience, become very dear to the natural members of this group. This is not primarily because they have been discovered, by rational analysis, to be especially suited to the needs of the group. In point of fact, they are seldom approached in the spirit of impartial, detached appraisal. Rather are they established and supported by custom, usage, tradition and plain inertia. This is what gives them their tenacity, and makes it so difficult to harmonize the ways of one group with those of another. Differences that rest upon reason offer some chance of adjustment; those that are purely matters of convention are well-nigh irreconcilable. Contrast, for instance, two engineers discussing the desirability of using nickel steel or vanadium steel for a certain mechanical end, with two husbands comparing monogamy and polygamy as the ideal form of the marriage institution.

It would be tedious and unprofitable to attempt to list all the group solutions of life problems that become standardized and sanctioned in folkways and mores. Some of the more important may be specified:

Language

Religion

Political system

Economic system

Moral code

Dress

Ornamentation

Family institutions—marriage, relations of husband and wife and parents and children, legal and social responsibilities of partners, divorce, etc.

Recreations—games, dances, sports

Holidays, political, religious, and other

Manners and social usages

Salutations

Educational institutions

Superstitions

Relations of unmarried persons of opposite sex

Music

Art

Literature

It must be clearly recognized that none of these are matters of race, though they are often so closely associated with racially identified groups as to give the illusion of racial character. They are all the products of group life and at the same time the foundations of group unity. As far as the individual is concerned they are, without exception, *acquired characteristics*. The infant comes into the world entirely devoid of any traces of culture. He proceeds immediately to begin to acquire culture, and he continues to acquire it as long as he lives. Whatsoever culture he has at any given time is the product of his group associations up to that time. But these cultural traits become so deeply etched into his emotional, intellectual, and spiritual nature that

they become actually a part of him, just as truly, though not so immutably, as his racial traits. On the whole, moreover, he is likely to be much more consciously aware of them than of most of his racial characters.

This cultural accumulation becomes profoundly infused with sentiments of loyalty, devotion, patriotism, justice, truth, and rightness. To depart from any of its canons involves not only the pain of the unfamiliar, but also the guilty sense of treachery. The fact that an exceptionally emancipated or sophisticated individual may criticize certain features of his own group culture on rational grounds does not destroy the hold that it has upon him in general.

To a social group bound together by a complex of cultural ties we give, for want of a better word, the name "nationality." Nationality is almost exclusively a matter of feeling. It is a product of the conscious and sub-conscious reactions of socially related individuals to each other, and to the group that they compose. It is obvious that the larger the number of basic folkways upon which the individuals feel alike or harmoniously, the stronger is the nationality. Nationality does not exist unless there is sympathy with respect to a considerable number of the more important elements. The height of national unity is reached when racial homogeneity is associated with identity of language, religion, moral standards, customs, and so on down the list to the very philosophy of life itself.

An immigrant background, therefore, is essentially a nationality. This nationality may be coterminous with

a political unit, or it may be a portion of a political unit, or it may include several political units, though political unity itself is obviously a factor in nationality. The nationality of Australians and New Zealanders is virtually the same, though they represent separate states. The immigrant arriving at an American port of entry brings with him a national character that has been inexorably impressed upon him by the influences of the group in which he has previously lived. It is not the same as the American national character, nor is it the same as his own national character would have been if he had been brought up in the United States.

The process of substituting the impress of the American nationality for that of a foreign nationality is assimilation. An essential step in really appreciating immigrant backgrounds is to comprehend the difficulty of this process. To this end it is useful to reflect that every individual is invariably nationalized into some social group. If this group is the one in which he is born and continues to reside the process takes place smoothly and unconsciously, and does not constitute a problem. The difficulty arises when a process of nationalization begun in one group is, as a result of migration, required to be completed in another group. Other things being equal, the earlier the age at which the transition takes place, the simpler is the task. For to the extent that the old nationality has been firmly fixed, the immigrant must go through a dual transformation. He must be denationalized and renationalized at the same time. The strain and stress of this experi-

ence is probably incomprehensible to one who has not gone through it.

The simplest way for a native of the United States to understand the nature of an immigrant background is to ask himself, as explicitly as possible, what "America" means to him. The best way to comprehend what is involved in the abandonment of a familiar background is to try to realize how it would affect him to give up his Americanism in favor of some foreign nationality.

CHAPTER II

THE BRITISH

By S. K. RATCLIFFE,

Publicist, Journalist, Lecturer.

IT is taken for granted by many people that the immigrant from Great Britain must of necessity find himself far less startled and bewildered than the Italian or the Central European when he meets the first shock of America. And this no doubt is so, for two reasons mainly. First, the Briton in the new country hears around him his own language, though spoken with what seems to him a quaint difference; and secondly, he is, perhaps in the majority of cases today, an urban worker and therefore no stranger to the life of an industrial or commercial city. But even so America must be to him a land of extraordinary strangeness. He has never seen anything like it. The scene, whether in town or country, is something that he could not have imagined. The external differences between England and America are altogether indescribable: and to begin with, there is the immense difference of scale.

Britain is a little land, rather more than twice the area of Ohio. All railway journeys are short, for the sea is within easy reach on all sides. The villages are tiny, and to the eye of the continental European, no less than to that of the American, the countryside seems cut

up by the hedges into the pattern of a crazy-quilt. The Russian or the German peasant is accustomed to the horizon of the wide plain; the English villager knows nothing of great distances. The city worker from Manchester or Birmingham, from Glasgow or Dundee, comes, it is true, from a relatively large and crowded centre, but the scale to which he is accustomed is still very small, and for him the mass and clangor of New York or Chicago, even of Cleveland or Detroit, cannot fail to be a crushing experience. Before crossing the Atlantic he thought, very likely, that Pittsburgh would be only Sheffield with an American accent. He finds that he has come, not only into a new country, but into a new and terrifying civilization.

It is not possible to draw in a page or two the actual contrast between Britain and America: between the English countryside and the prairie, between an industrial district in Lancashire and an industrial section of Pennsylvania or Illinois. But the sharpness of the differences can to some extent be made clear by a brief description of a typical English village and an average manufacturing town.

Life in the English village, work in the English fields, present very few features in common with rural conditions on this continent. The English rural worker is a member of a submerged class, whose forefathers have lived in servitude for ages. He earns a pitifully small wage, is fed on a diet more meager than the worst known in America, and lives in a cottage that may be picturesque but is certainly minute and primitive, while he has been conscious from childhood of his helpless-

ness under the weight of that ancient feudal authority still surviving in the landlord and the parson. By the time he grows up he has been through some years of schooling. His wife as well as himself can vote. He may even be elected a member of the rural council. But none the less has he remained only one remove from serfdom. He is a long way from the relative independence that is enjoyed by the industrial worker in Britain. He is accustomed only to small-scale farming, and is wedded to the old ways. The vast areas, the mighty crops, the mechanical methods of western agriculture are marvels of which he could form no conception, while the careless freedom and constant mobility of the American farm worker bespeak a social condition which strikes him at first as belonging to another world.

On the other hand, a mental picture of industrial Britain would comprise a spreading Sahara of manufacturing districts, linked by the interurban trolley and motor-bus. The towns are laid out without plan, but the streets of very small houses tend to be built in straight rows. In Yorkshire and in Wales they are of grey stone; elsewhere generally of dull red brick. The frame house is never seen; the detached dwelling is almost unknown. The typical workman's cottage in a row has one or two storeys. It consists of four, five, or six tiny rooms; in Scotland commonly of only two rooms, "but and ben"—that is, fore and aft—with sleeping places in the wall. The self-respecting household regards the cottage as a one-family dwelling: but the taking of a lodger is not unusual, and, since the

long wartime cessation of building, the shortage of house room has greatly enhanced the problem of congestion. The life of the family goes on in the little kitchen-living-room, in which nearly all the year round the coal fire is kept burning.

The workman's cottage is usually a clutter of stuff: the simplified furnishing of a German tenement or of the newer American small house has not yet been adopted in England. If there is a front parlor, it is still not for daily use. Gas is everywhere installed. Electricity is a luxury in the English house, even of the middle classes; it is unknown to the workman's family, except for the negligible minority living in a garden town or suburb. Central heating is not even a dream: it has not been heard of. The rows of houses in the industrial cities are built back-to-back, with no through ventilation, or, in the case of those of the better grade, with a passage between the brick walls of the tiny yards.

The plumbing is confined as a rule to the kitchen sink. There is no running water upstairs, and of course no bathroom. The vast majority of working-class dwellings in Britain are without a fixed bath-tub or even the simplest convenience for washing the body. The English working girl—scrupulous in personal cleanliness, and ever more and more exacting in her standards of dress and adornment—carries on an incessant war against disheartening circumstances, and triumphs over them to a surprising extent. As for the working-class housewife, she has been for generations in all communities associated with the staple industries, a fine example of industry and house-pride.

Among the better-paid working-class families there is a certain tradition of generous feeding. England, says Henry Nevins, is "a land of joints and roots and solid pudding, of ham-and-eggs, and violent tea." But no comparison could be made today between the table of even a well-paid English artisan and that regarded as a decent minimum by the average manual worker in the United States and Canada. Until ten years ago food prices in England, with the exception of meat, were remarkably low. The cured herring and haddock were almost universal food. Bread and potatoes were cheap, the working people of England being chiefly bread-eaters. Although declining after the war-time rise the prices of necessities are still far too high. The English workers, while better off than their continental competitors, are not by any means adequately or intelligently fed. Their meals are frequently compared with those of America or the European continent. They are badly balanced and too often poorly cooked. Bread is still made at home in many households of northern England, where also there persists a pride in the baking of pies and cakes. Tea is drunk in large quantities, with ill effects upon the digestion, especially of women. The diet of the poor is deplorable, as indeed are all their home conditions. One good meat dinner in a week is thought of in tens of thousands of households as a barely attainable maximum. The men undoubtedly consume too much beer, particularly on Saturday nights, and Americans, whether favorable to prohibition or not, are shocked at the crowding of

women and girls in the bars of the corner saloons. In recent years, however, the alcoholic strength of the liquor has been reduced, the trade is heavily taxed, and there has been a steady, if slow, movement towards sobriety in all classes. Despite external evidences only too easy to collect, the working folk of Britain during the past generation have made immense advances in behavior and common standards.

The recreations of the masses of city dwellers in Britain are not materially different from those of the corresponding classes in America. The movie theatres are crowded: in the large towns it is a rare thing, even among the very poor, for pennies not to be procurable for the pictures. The more comfortable classes play every sort of outdoor game, with lawn tennis leading easily in the matter of numbers. Speaking generally, however, the workers take small part in such games, although with the extension of public recreation grounds the opportunities are continually on the increase. Their dominant sporting interest is twofold. First, it is displayed at the football matches (cricket has never been the premier sporting interest of the multitude) played on Saturdays on the outskirts of the great towns. These events draw enormous crowds, of anything between 20,000 and 100,000, the bulk of the spectators being working men and youths, their heads covered with the British artisan's cloth cap. Secondly, there is the all-pervading, the astonishing, custom of "having a bit on"—that is, of making small bets on horse-racing, a practice that gives to the British work-

ing people a character which, apparently, is not shared in any equal degree by any other community in the world except the Australians.

The civic institutions under which the working people of Britain live have made noteworthy advances in the past forty years. The municipal government is on the whole good; the sanitary services have been improved, although the public health service still lags behind the standard set by the most advanced countries. The elementary school system has been steadily carried, and gives promise of being in the near future comparable with the best teaching systems in the world. Free libraries have been multiplied; there is a vigorous and growing movement of adult education, and among all classes of the people foreigners take note of a widespread and eager interest in public questions.

Of that interest, needless to say, the most striking proof is the advance of the political Labor Party, from feeble beginnings 35 years ago to the commanding position which it occupies today. The basis, and the main numerical strength, of the Labor Party is in the trade unions, who furnish the bulk of the votes and the major part of the parliamentary representation. But within the past ten years the party has widened its appeal and gathered recruits from all classes. It is served by a devoted brigade of the intelligentsia and, as the MacDonald Cabinet proved, is able to draw upon reserves of aristocratic leadership and administrative experience. In political opinion the Labor Party is essentially constitutional and moderate. Its left wing is an unmistakable minority; but all compe-

tent observers recognize that, in the event of Britain's having to endure a long-continued period of industrial distress, the revolutionary elements would almost certainly declare themselves, and perhaps in formidable guise. Hitherto, however, the law-abiding character of the working folk, together with their remarkable steadfastness and common-sense, has been maintained.

There exists today, as always in the past, among the English work-people a very large element of serious folk, deeply interested in politics, in church matters, and in the practical working of national and voluntary institutions. Historically, the labor unions and the benefit societies belong together as examples of community effort. They are related to that deep and permanent element in the English character that has found expression in the many agencies of collective self-help, created and fostered by the conditions of a stable and homogeneous laboring population, striving generation after generation towards a modest betterment of living conditions, which in their basic aspects are deemed to be essentially unalterable. The British worker, speaking generally, accepts the class system. He may resent its inequalities and glaring injustices, but hitherto he has not seriously challenged its right or necessity. He has no feeling hostile to the monarchy. He thinks of the king and queen as an institution that he has no need to worry about. They do not rule; they have no power to tax, while a popular prince or princess makes pretty copy for the Sunday papers. The American worker's cool recognition that every kind of success, every form of advancement, may be open to him, has had no place

in the British worker's consciousness. It is doubtful whether the coming of the first Labor Government made any difference worth mentioning in the mental outlook of the class which put Ramsay MacDonald into office, although it would be as well to recognize that the creation of a second, and stronger, Labor Cabinet will mean a great enlargement of equalitarian sentiment. Foreign observers too frequently make the assumption that the British working people have been content to muddle along from age to age, discontentedly resigned to allowing the more fortunate classes to confer favors upon them and to conduct their public business. In the villages that has been and still is largely true; but it would be a great mistake to suppose that it is true of the industrial workers and especially of organized labor.

On the contrary, the outstanding characteristic of the British artisan has been the combination of a generic individualist character with a remarkable power of creating and building up agencies of collective effort and mutual aid. The large insurance and benefit societies, the more important of them with a record of nearly a century's growth, offer a remarkable example of this power. The labor unions are not by any means to be regarded merely as agencies for the organizing of pressure upon the employers or as the nucleus of the political labor party. Far from it: they built up their reserves in the main on the basis of their mutual benefit funds. And more impressive still as evidence of the power of combination for communal service is the amazing structure of the Consumers' Co-operative

Movement—frequently called by American writers the Rochdale plan, from the pioneer enterprise of a group of co-operative store-keepers in a small Lancashire town. From that feeble little undertaking, started by 28 working-men in the midnight of industrial England, has grown an enormous business—manufacturing, wholesale, and retail—on a national scale, employing tens of thousands of people, and with an annual turnover running into billions of dollars.

The co-operative societies, the women's co-operative guild, the thrift and benefit associations—these and kindred organizations, entirely the creation of the artisan class, have played their part in the emancipation of the British workers. They have, again, been important as educative agencies in the working out of a self-governing democracy. Nor, in this connection, should we overlook the importance of the free churches in the development of the wider labor movement. The word "free" is especially emphasized, because the influences here referred to are specifically those of the non-conformist bodies as opposed to that unique state establishment, the Episcopal Church of England. Roughly speaking, the labor movements of other European countries have been detached from, or opposed to, the Church, while in Britain they have from the beginning been markedly influenced by the spirit of religious non-conformity. In their earlier stages both the co-operative societies and the labor unions were frequently led by men who had learned their first lessons in public speaking and in committee methods in the little self-governing community of the Methodist or Congrega-

tional chapel, while the continuance of this influence may be illustrated by reference to the first Labor Government under Ramsay MacDonald. Certainly in that Administration could be found at least half a dozen men whose introduction to the public platform had come to them as lay preachers in the service of one or other of the free churches. These stand, and have stood, as the religious institutions of the middle and laboring classes; and hence, throughout the past two centuries, as a powerful section of progressive Britain, the Church of England being, as Maude Royden wittily said, merely the Conservative party at prayer. In few things, certainly, may we see the social contrast between England and America more strikingly displayed than in the social standing of the respective churches. There are regions of America where the Methodist and Baptist churches are identified with the governing order. In England no member of the older governing classes can be found in any one of the non-conformist churches. "Tell me," said an American to an Anglican clergyman visiting this country, "do you believe there is any way to heaven other than the way provided by the Church of England?" "Well," was the inimitable reply, "there may be: but if there is, no gentleman would take advantage of it!"

Of the British national character it is extraordinarily difficult to speak in definite terms or without constant caution and qualification. There is, of course, no single or coherent national character. Between the people of the Scottish highlands, the East Anglican fens, the Welsh valleys, and the Devonshire moors there are dif-

ferences of habit and disposition and dialect that are extraordinary, especially when we remember the smallness of the country and the contiguity of the contrasted communities. Two points, perhaps, may be particularly noted in conclusion. The first is that the Englishman of legend and of caricature, is a type made up of characteristics which insofar as they are actual, belong to an exceedingly small and specialized class—the narrow, inbred, privileged order, originally connected with the feudal ownership of land. Always few in number, this type is rapidly vanishing. The Englishman and woman of the common people, whether in the London area or in the industrial north and midlands, is in the main a casual, easy-tempered, good-natured creature, open-hearted and helpful. There is no more kindly people anywhere in the world. The second point is that, as all who know them are driven to agree, the British are endowed with an almost unlimited self-assurance, a sense of their own rightness, a conviction of their superiority to all “foreigners,” a complacency which refuses to admit, that any portion of the earth can be equal to their own land. And this self-assurance is above all class distinctions.

The racial composition of the population of Great Britain is of especial interest to the United States because it was from this source that its own population was mainly drawn during the generations when the basic constitution of the American people was being formed. Something like 90 per cent of the people of the United

States at the time of the first Census in 1790 were of British origin, and the proportion still remains very high.

There is strictly no such thing as an English race. The aboriginal population of the British Isles was doubtless primitive Mediterranean, like that of most of the rest of middle-western and south-western Europe. This was a long-headed, and presumably dark-skinned and dark-eyed stock. Later on, but still long before the Christian era, there was a strong infiltration of round-headed people, representing what is now generally known as the Alpine race, also generally brunet in type.

The infusion of blond, or so-called "Nordic," blood, did not come until relatively recent centuries, though its origin doubtless runs back into pre-Christian times. The major details of this great intermingling, with its sources in several of the Teutonic and Scandinavian countries, are familiar to every student of English history. The result is what is rather loosely known as the "Anglo-Saxon race." In point of fact, these various elements have never been entirely blended, and to be British racially means simply that one probably has very little blood that is not basically Mediterranean, Alpine, or Nordic. How much one may have of one or the other depends entirely upon circumstances.

H. P. F.

CHAPTER III

THE FRENCH-CANADIANS

By WILLIAM WOOD,

*Colonel in Canadian Army; Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada;
author of "In the Heart of Old Canada," etc.*

FRENCH-CANADIANS are so well known to so many people in such a very superficial way, and they are so pervertingly described in advertising travelogues for hurried tourists who want to get the "foreignneering" thrill without the annoyances of distracting complex truths, that really serious enquirers might like to begin by learning what the French-Canadians most certainly are not.

First of all, they are obviously not immigrants from overseas, when they do come into the United States, but a North-American people who have lived a New-World life far longer than most Americans. Then they are emphatically not French, in spite of their French descent; for they differ from the present French of France far more than Mayflower New Englanders differ from the English of today. Besides, they have not been constantly recruited, like Americans of British blood, by new streams of immigrants from the old land overseas. Their most important age of immigration was a very short one; only a few thousand colonists arrived, certainly less than ten thousand altogether, and

most of these had become Canadian settlers a century before the United States began an independent life. The ordinary French-Canadians do not speak a *patois*, but, for the most part, a form of French in which several northern local forms were fused, though with a strong preponderance of Norman. To this fusion must be added a conservation of some older forms extinct in modern French, and a natural variation from environment, with an equally natural tendency toward Anglicisms, more especially in reference to the newer ways of economic life. In speech, as in most other things, the French-Canadians differ among themselves as other peoples do, some speaking like modern highly educated Frenchmen, others quite as well, but with a more Canadian accent; while those with less education naturally follow the more purely local ways. Nearly all are deeply attached to the French language. English, for business reasons, may be the language of the head; but French remains the language of the heart.

The French-Canadians are not by any means confined to the Province of Quebec, though that is their headquarters. They have four other homes: Ontario and Northwestern Canada on one side, Acadia and New England on the other. Their famous *Habitants* (farming settlers) are not peasants, and never have been, in the proper European meaning of the word. The real habitants do not now form the major portion of the race; for lumbering and factories employ at least as many as the farms. Nor yet are even the home-dwelling French-Canadians so preponderantly rural now; for Montreal alone contains a good half-million

of them—enough to make it count among the very few French-speaking cities whose populations are second only to that of Paris. The much described *Seigneurs* never formed a *haute noblesse* or, indeed, a regular nobility of any kind at all; though they were persons of importance in their day, more especially with regard to genuine colonization—they were, indeed, meant to be the colonizing agents of the Crown, not like the French noblesse or even English landlords. *Bourgeois*, again, is not the same word in Canada now as it is in France; nor was it ever quite like the *Bourgeois Gentil-homme* of Molière, though that is somewhat nearer. As for the French-Canadians in the mass, the oft-exploded charge against a supposedly large proportion of their immigrating ancestors is hardly worth the merest mention here; for all serious students can now prove for themselves, from the original archives, the falsity of the statement that many of the early settlers were exported convicts, common jail-birds, or suchlike “undesirables” at home. Again, the real infusion of Indian blood was very small indeed at any time, and probably does not affect more than an extremely small fraction of the population at the present day. Moreover, some of this infusion was, in itself, by no means bad. Another “not” may now be entered against the belief (or is it accusation?) that French-Canadians are “no good at business.” It is true that nearly all the bigger kinds of business began among the English-speaking men in Canada, that most continues in their hands today, and that what may be called Big Business is new, and still uncommon, among French-Canadians,

even in Montreal. But there, and elsewhere too, some have grasped it firmly and with "developmental" hands.

Finally, our "nots" should not end here without one more—without one which goes to the very root of all questions of "immigrant backgrounds," and immigrant foregrounds too: the vital question of assimilation. The French-Canadians are preponderantly French-Canadian still, with constitutional guarantees in Canada for the continuance of that quadrilateral defense against assimilation which depends, not so much upon the strength of any one side as upon the perfect conjunction of all four, especially within the Province of Quebec: laws, language, religion, race. Of course the French-Canadians have no specific racial rights as such; and Canada is free for all religions too. But in the Province of Quebec the Catholic Church, which is overwhelmingly French-Canadian, has rights which are officially prescribed for members of its own communion, even though it is not an established church; while the civil law is French and French-Canadian to the core. Add to this the constitutional rights of the French language, not only in the Province but throughout the whole Dominion, remember what mutual support a separate race derives from using a separate language, and the innate resistance to assimilation may be fairly gauged. Remember too, that assimilation of three different kinds has already been successfully resisted for three hundred years. First, the French-Canadians, when under French rule, resisted the forcible assimilation that might have followed conquest by English-

speaking people in the earlier Colonial days, long before Independence. Then they resisted some well-meant efforts at assimilation under the earlier British rule in Canada. Finally, they got their own specifics against assimilation put into the constitution of the new Dominion of Canada in 1867. These, and their own persistent French-Canadianism, have prevented most kinds of assimilation in Canada down to the present day, while they have even prevented many finishing touches of assimilation among some French-Canadians whose homes are in the States.

Turning to the positive side of the French-Canadians, one cannot help admiring a people that has been so very true to type. This truth to type itself implies a great cohesive force which we shall now examine briefly, with reference to its strongest constituent parts:—race, religion, language, laws, the family, and fecundity.

In race the French-Canadians are probably nine-tenths pure French. We have just seen how extremely little Indian blood they have, and that this is only to be found in a very few families. The blood of English-speaking people is much commoner, especially when these are Catholics; and intermarriage occurs more frequently when French-Canadians are bilingual than when they speak only French. But the vast majority are of purely French descent. They differ, however, very widely from the modern French. This difference began, and was noted by acute observers, even under the French régime. It naturally continued, with increasing force, when British rule began. From the Conquest to Confederation, over a hundred years (1763—

1867) the French and French-Canadians lived very different lives indeed. Imagine a French community three thousand miles from France that never experienced the French Revolution and whose leaders were intensely hostile to it, that never knew the two Napoleonic Empires, nor the whole evolution of modern France. Then imagine what further differences would arise from there having been very little personal touch between the French and French-Canadians for this whole century: very few travellers from either country to the other, not much business, and this mostly indirect, a very small exchange of correspondence, a constantly growing difference from environment, and an absolute difference in all things governmental between French rule on either side of the Atlantic and the constantly developing new life within the British Empire. In recent years the increasing facilities of travel have naturally brought some French and French-Canadians into closer personal contact. But they have grown, and they remain, apart. Business men of both countries may talk the common language of the market to each other in Montreal or Paris. The Intellectuals may exchange congenial ideas. The modern French colony in Montreal may intermix and even intermarry. But the general run of French and French-Canadians differ greatly from each other; and even the most ultra-*Nationaliste* French-Canadian politician feels more at home with the British Parliament in London than with the Chamber of Deputies in Paris.

Religion, as represented by the Roman Catholic Church, surrounds the French-Canadians from the cradle to the grave. Under the French régime non-

Catholics of all kinds were excluded from New France; and though a very few Huguenots and other dissenters occasionally entered they never formed more than a microscopically small proportion of the population and were of no significance at any time. Then, from the very day on which the last French army in New France laid down its arms at Montreal in 1760, the British conquerors allowed not only freedom of religion but the practical continuance of all the "accustomed rights and dues" of the French-Canadian clergy. The Quebec Act of 1774 confirmed these rights all over the then-established vast new Province of Quebec, which included not only most of Ontario but also what are now five and a half states of the Union (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and northeastern Minnesota). This Province, with its French-Canadian-clergy rights, shrank into approximately its present size (less Labradorian Quebec) after the recognition of the United States; and the Constitutional Act of 1791 re-confirmed the "accustomed rights and dues" accordingly. From that time to this the same rights and dues have been continued within the Province of Quebec alone.

The situation thus created is most peculiar, perhaps unique; for though all Roman Catholics are equally recognized under the terms of the Constitutional Act and its re-affirmations in later years, the French-Canadian clergy and religious institutions, having been the first to take root in the Province, and having the overwhelming majority of the people for their parishioners, alone reaped the full effect. Their influence was also vastly increased by the fact that they were the only considerable class of French-Canadian leaders the French-

Canadians had during the early days of British rule. Most members of the official and other leading classes under the French régime went to France after the Conquest; and those that remained did not form a powerfully correlated class in at all the same way as the clergy. Consequently, the parish, more than ever, became the home, and the clergy and "religious" the almost earthly Providence, of nearly all the French-Canadians, to an extent well-nigh incredible to those who have never known parochial life from an inside point of view. Strangers who come up the St. Lawrence to Montreal from the sea always remark how very conspicuous the churches and religious institutions are; and this omnipresence in buildings is indeed a true reflection of the religious powers within. For, just as the houses of the habitants flock round the shepherding parish church, so do the bodies, souls, and spirits of the habitants themselves flock round their own parochial shepherd. Of course there are a few recalcitrants among the modern French-Canadians, especially in the larger towns, just as there always have been in the world elsewhere. But, taken as a whole, their clergy and "religious" held—and, for the most part, nobly earned—a leadership whose power still endures and whose beneficence is, on the whole, acknowledged by those, not of their own faith, that really know it best. This leadership, with many adaptations to new localities and ways of life, is still exercised, in modified forms, by the devoted clergy and "religious" who follow their faithful into Ontario, over the Canadian Northwest Provinces, throughout that old Acadia which is still found among

the Maritime Provinces of Canada, or even into New England, where there are now a good million French-Canadians and over a hundred parishes in which the schools and churches are more or less bilingual and Roman Catholic through and through.

Language is often made a burning question; and the "pacific penetration" of English is often greatly feared. The French language is expressly guaranteed as equally official with the English all over the Dominion of Canada. But French-Canadians in the Dominion Parliament always speak English when wishing to make a nation-wide appeal. In the Quebec Provincial Parliament, however, French is almost universal. The best educated French-Canadians all speak English, many exceedingly well; and most French-Canadians in contact with English-speaking Canadians speak it fairly. On the other hand, very few English-speaking people, of any kind at all, speak French; and, when they do, they generally speak it so badly that you wish they wouldn't try. The remoter habitants and other less educated classes in the country parts, especially in the Province of Quebec, generally speak nothing but French. Yet economic pressure, the economic lure of new developments staffed by English-speaking people, the vacation homing tours of bilingual French-Canadians, the influx of American tourists, and the desire of being "as good as the next man," all combine to increase the use of English. For bilingual appointments the English-speaking man or woman born stands little chance against the French-Canadians, who are, as a rule, by far the apter pupils.

Canadian laws are English, except in the Province of Quebec, in which only the criminal law is English while the civil law is French. Of course this civil law has been greatly developed. But the *coûtume de Paris*, established for *La Nouvelle France* by royal decree in 1540 (68 years before the real New France took root at Quebec under Champlain) can still be quoted in court. This *coûtume de Paris* marked the centralizing forces then at work in France, where the Kings were trying to supplant the old-established "customs" of provincial courts by the unifying "custom" of their own royal courts in Paris. One rather non-ultra-modern effect of the Quebec Provincial civil law is that which absorbs the wife's whole fortune (of course including all her private earnings) into the husband's, unless there was a pre-nuptial notarial contract guaranteeing "separation of goods." When domestic infelicities occur, always ask if the marriage was performed in the Province of Quebec, and, if so, with or without a *séparation des biens*.

Family life is intensely strong among the French-Canadians. You really do "marry into" the family of a *canadienne*; for you become part and parcel of it in a way unknown among the English-speaking peoples of the present day. There is a very fine and pleasing side to this; for mutual "aid and comfort" between "in-laws" is very common. But there also is, occasionally, a seamy side, in which a wife's family may be more than interfering; and so may a husband's.

When Zola wrote his yearning romance about *Fécondité* in France he might have found the thing

itself among the French-Canadians; for no modern people have ever surpassed their marvellous expansion from within themselves alone. The well-substantiated original evidence goes to prove that there were certainly a good deal less than ten thousand immigrating French men and women who became the ancestors of some three million pure-blooded French-Canadians of the present day. In other words, the French-Canadians, from within themselves alone, have multiplied three hundred times over in the last three hundred years. (This estimate excludes a fourth million, which might be, and often is, reckoned in with the other three; but which should not be counted here, because it includes some who are either French-of-France or very near descendants of the very few French immigrants of recent times, as well as those who are more or less non-French by blood, and those who, whether pure-bloods or not, have now become thoroughly American.) When the Quebec Provincial Government used to give a hundred acres of free land to any father of twelve living children the pile of attested applications was something fit "to make surrounding nations stare." But still more remarkable is the fact that some logical and still more prolific couples thought these free lands ought to be given *à la douzaine*, and so applied for two hundred acres, because they had twenty-four children or more. No wonder *la survivance franco-canadienne* is a very favorite theme with would-be winners of a *Prix David*!

"Manners and customs" can be well enough inferred from the various facts we have examined already. But perhaps a few concluding words might be devoted to

them. In doing this we must remember that the present century has seen, and is seeing now, considerable changes from the old-established French-Canadian ways, even within the Province of Quebec.

Education is a Provincial affair in Canada; in Quebec it is officially divided into Catholic and Protestant; and the Catholic clergy determine everything that comes within the extensive sphere of "faith and morals." (Though not compulsory, free, and universal in the American sense, it more or less fulfils the same idea in practice; though of course with local variation.) There are very few illiterates now. The general standard has risen greatly in recent years, from village schools to universities, and most rungs of the ladder are now within the reach of the fittest pupils, from the humbler business courses up the intellectual scale. Due attention is paid to the social amenities as well as to mere instruction, more especially in the convent schools for girls; and a pleasant French politeness is the general result. This pervades all social classes, as it does in France; and so promotes the charm of intercourse all round. Holidays are mostly as the Church prescribes. There is official observance of Dominion Day; and the clergy all through Quebec, being loyal to the Crown (under which they have privileges quite unknown elsewhere) duly remember the birthday of the King. But, in addition to the great Church festivals, the *en-masse* French-Canadian holiday is on St. John the Baptist's fête (June 24). Then the crowds may be seen at play; and to advantage; for the general behavior is very good indeed. The ordinary amusements are usually

simple enough among the ordinary people. Cards are very popular everywhere, bowling alleys much frequented, and quite informal sing-songs still common among a population that has not yet forgotten all its remarkably appealing old French folklore. In recent years the French-Canadians have successfully entered every kind of outdoor sport, more especially ice hockey, skiing, curling, baseball, football, tennis, and golf.

Quebec is not a prohibition Province. But the Liquor Commission is entirely under government control; and drunkenness is quite unusual among the people living there. Crime, too, is comparatively rare, especially of the major kinds; though of course the French-Canadians have all the common human failings, and a commercial metropolis like Montreal, with its very mixed million, naturally produces a fairly long roll. Divorce being anathema to all good Catholics, the French-Canadians do not go further than separation from bed and board, often without the intervention of the law, but with the kindly offices of local clergy. In such affairs publicity is avoided as much as possible, even in cases where the press might make a "snappy story." Most English-speaking people in all countries claim that publicity, with all its faults, is generally worth while risking as a safeguard against miscarriages of justice, even in cases which involve some kind of unpleasant social scandal. Most French-speaking people, however, claim that it is best to keep whatever can be safely kept away from press and public both. The actual line of safety remains a sort of No-man's land between.

The ordinary French-Canadian inclines to be a handy

man, adaptable, and willing; good at lumbering, construction help, and factory work; with abilities well beyond these in some directions too. He still forms labor unions within the sympathetic purview of his Church, which is on the side of business stability, and which, while watchful for all its faithful can reasonably claim, is thoroughly anti-Bolshevist as well.

The French-Canadians produce a very high proportion of lawyer-politicians; the French are a rather litigious race, and French-Canadians take their share of local, Provincial, and Dominion politics. But, though race-patriots, they do not carry race-politics nearly so far (in, say, New England) as some other racial patriots do.

The intellectual life is far too complex for discussion here. But it is followed by a relatively large class in certain lines: literature, art, and music predominating over pure science; and all more or less varying from environment.

Quite possibly the reader of this little sketch may end by quoting the old French aphoristic saying, with full regard to most things French-Canadian—*plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*: and that is partly true. But French-Canadians are also developing, along their own strong line, within this changing world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

François-Xavier Garneau, *Histoire du Canada*, Fifth Edition
by Hector Garneau, 1913-20 (also in English translation)
Thomas Chapais, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada*, 1919-23

Henri Raymond Casgrain, *Un Pelerinage au Pays d'Évangéline*,
1887

Louis Hémon, *Maria Chapdelaine*, 1921 (also in English translation)

William Wood, Articles on French-Canadian Literature:

Encyclopedia Britannica, Edition of 1911

Encyclopedia Britannica Yearbook, 1913

Encyclopedia Britannica, New Volumes, 1921

CHAPTER IV

THE GERMANS

By KUNO FRANCKE,

Professor Emeritus of the History of German Culture and Honorary Curator of the Germanic Museum of Harvard University; author of "German After-war Problems."

IT would be a mistake to assume that the national or even the racial background of our German immigrants was something in any sense uniform. On the contrary, no other immigrant background contains a greater diversity of types. Racially, there is the greatest difference of temperament between the various ethnical units included in the political unit of what is now the German Republic. The choleric Bavarian, the light-hearted Franconian, the deep, mystically inclined Swabian, the effervescent Rhinelander, the bright and gentle Thuringian, the impassionate, melancholy Silesian, the stubborn, slow-moving Low German, the smart and versatile Prussian—these are only a few of the variations which the generic term "German" embraces. Added to this, there is the difference of the social surroundings within which the immigrant has grown up. Has he, in youth, imbibed the radical, rationalist atmosphere of a great international centre like Berlin or Hamburg? Has he been reared within the confines of either Protestant or Catholic churchli-

ness? Does he come from a region resonant with the battle cries of modern industrial conflict, like the Ruhr district or Saxony? Or is he emerging from the comparative seclusion and peace of farm life in Schleswig-holstein or the Black Forest? All these questions suggest just as many different forms of national background of the German immigrant, and should therefore be taken into consideration by immigration officials, social workers and teachers trying to smoothe the way for the newcomer in a new world.

Moreover, it should not be forgotten that millions of persons of German stock by the treaties of Versailles and St. Germain have been forced out of their former political allegiances and live at present under the rule of foreign majorities. German immigrants of this number—whether from Czecho-Slovakia, or the Polish Corridor, or South Tyrol, or Transsylvania—are likely to have a particularly intense consciousness of national traditions, and should accordingly be considered as a class of their own. And finally, conditions in Germany itself have undergone since the War and are still undergoing such radical changes in political methods, in the intercourse of the sexes, in education, in the relation between Church and State, in public rights and responsibilities of the individual, in fact in all the great concerns of life, that it will take not a little perspicacity to diagnose correctly the exact state of mind from the background of which a given immigrant's decision to seek new paths of activity may have arisen.

With all these reservations, however, there remain certain clear outlines of a common background shared

by all German immigrants to this country—a background of conditions, traditions, modes of thought, and habits of conduct peculiarly German.

The German immigrant probably more strongly than any other, with the exception of the cognate Dutch and Scandinavians, shows the effect of centuries of systematic intellectual drill. In the first place, there is the practically complete absence of illiteracy. Whatever may be said against considering the ability to read and write as the foremost standard in gauging the value of a body of immigrants for future citizenship, the absence of this ability certainly constitutes a formidable handicap. But in addition to being free from this handicap, the German immigrant usually brings over a stock of information far outranking that of the ordinary immigrant from many other countries. And it should be emphatically said that in this respect it makes little difference whether he comes from the Protestant or the Catholic parts of Germany. For ever since the 18th century era of enlightenment have the governments of both Protestant and Catholic States of the Empire bestowed solicitous care upon school matters, have made indeed obligatory education in State-controlled schools a part of their administrative policy. And through the introduction of universal military service, at the beginning of the 19th century, there has been added another valuable element of general training of German youth in careful observation of the actual world and in close attention to practical affairs.

It may perhaps be doubted whether this universal and systematic schooling of German youth has had an

altogether wholesome effect upon the German masses. It may have contributed to a general overestimation of the acquisition of knowledge as compared with the training of the will; and it may have tended to produce mass docility rather than personal initiative, although individual Germans certainly have shown no lack of brilliant personal enterprise and will power either during or after the War. However this may be, the fact remains that the majority of German immigrants arrive in this country with a stock of knowledge and habits of study which should enable them to make their way with exceptional success. To direct that kind of immigrants into the right channels from the start is therefore a service of exceptional importance not only to them but to the community as well.

A second common feature of the German immigrant background is a highly developed sense of orderliness and thrift. This also is the heritage of many successive generations. Only orderliness and thrift have made it possible for the German people to maintain itself through the almost continuous succession of political disasters and foreign invasions that devastated German soil from the 16th century on to the Age of Napoleon. And even throughout the larger part of the 19th century, in the period of national consolidation that finally led to the establishment of the Hohenzollern Empire, have smallness of means and the need of strictest economy been a widely prevailing signature of German life. Of what other king or head of State could be told what is credibly known of old King William I of Prussia, later first German Em-

peror, that, in memory of the hardships endured by his father and mother after the collapse of Prussia under the Napoleonic armies, he maintained in the very midst of his own memorably successful reign the habit of using envelopes of letters addressed to him as envelopes for his answers by turning them inside out. In and after the World War have blockade, Ruhr invasion and inflation taught millions of starving Germans even grimmer lessons than former generations had gone through; and again these lessons have not been lost. The broad belts of thousands and thousands of workingmen's vegetable gardens, scrupulously tilled and daily cared for by all members of their families, which surround in greater profusion than ever all German towns or industrial establishments, render ample testimony to it. There is no public institution in any other country comparable to these municipally rented gardens of German workingmen.

As a third striking feature of the traditional background of the German immigrant should be mentioned the fact that, unless he comes from the very lowest stratum of proletarian conditions—which is seldom the case—he has been living under home influences which in one way or another favorably affected his aesthetic and cultural sensibilities.

✓ To be sure, modern industrialized Germany shares with all the great manufacturing countries the machine-made, monotonous, soulless aspect of factory architecture. But even within this desert of vast ugliness presented by the industrial centres there are to be found more often than in other countries oases of comfortable

workingmen's colonies with their brick walls, their tiled roofs, cozy verandahs, and pretty flower beds. And that in these modest but friendly workingmen's houses close to the gigantic workshops of capitalism the sense for beauty and the interest in serious problems are not an altogether rare occurrence and often only wait to be touched upon by the right person to respond with surprising vigor, is attested by many observers. Professor Max Friedlaender of Berlin University, the distinguished music critic, told me that of all the audiences of his frequent lecturing tours throughout Germany he remembered none with greater satisfaction than a concourse of thousands of Krupp laborers listening to his exposition of Bach's Passion Music. Last year a whole week was devoted by the city of Essen to a workingmen's course upon the achievements of modern medicine for popular hygiene, all lectures being given by foremost specialists representing nearly all German universities; and again the attention of the large laborers' audiences is reported to have been unflagging, or rather increasingly intense from day to day.

As for practical training in at least the elements of art, it is well known that singing and drawing have for many decades been obligatory subjects in all German schools. And whatever may be said about the artistic merits of the numberless singing societies without which life in even the smallest village of Germany is simply unthinkable, they certainly have kept native popular song from being drowned out by the meaningless noise of the modern vaudeville, and they have made it possible for the recreation days of the common German

people to be days of wholesome enjoyment and spiritual refreshment.

Turning to the higher forms of national culture, we may say that, with the exception of Fascist Italy, no European country has presented during the last hundred years so pronounced a type of corporate consciousness as Germany. Germany reached the climax of her spiritual, literary, and artistic culture much later than either England, France, Italy, or Spain, that is, much nearer to our own time. Goethe, Schiller, Beethoven, Kant—to mention only the greatest names—are in a way still contemporaries. Their dramas, poems, philosophies, tone creations dominate the national imagination in a way to which there is no parallel in this country. They are felt as the creators of that spiritual Germany without which there would have been no German Empire. They and their successors down to Wagner, Nietzsche, and Hauptmann are held up to German youth as symbols of the national striving for high achievement, as the champions of everything that is fine and noble in German character. That during the War Goethe's "Faust" should have found its way together with the Bible into the knapsacks of hundreds of thousands of German soldiers, makes one realize to what extent the gospel of salvation through incessant striving, preached by the classic writers of the Weimar age, has come to be a German national shibboleth. All the manifold manifestations of German activity in the 19th century were attuned to this key. Hopefulness, daring, ambition, wide perspective, joy in adventure, pride

in construction on a large scale pervaded everything—not only army manoeuvres and naval programs, but also antitoxin researches, x-ray investigations, excavations at Troy or Olympia, the race for the blue ribbon of ocean records, for colonial expansion in Africa, or the opening of Asia Minor to central European trade. And all these activities formed a conscious whole, they were all part of the exuberant life of a young nation, for the first time in its history feeling its mettle and irresistibly impelled to try its strength.

It must of course not be assumed that the average German immigrant arriving at our shores has a clear conception of any of these high sounding things. He is probably for the most part quite unaffected by the emotional intensity which is stored up in these national longings. Indeed, if he has gone through the terrible disenchantment of the War, he may be inclined to look upon most of them as falsehoods and phantoms. Nevertheless, the high impulse, the daring idealism of a century of collective national effort is still reverberating in the German youth of today and gives it a character all its own. When Count Luckner, the hero of the raider "Seeadler," announced a year ago that he had fitted out a four-masted schooner for a peaceful circumnavigation of the globe and was ready to hire a crew of some forty men, he received some 16,000 applications. That figure is not only a terrible comment upon the blocking of the avenues for useful work which is the bane of present-day Germany; it is also a striking revelation of the spirit of adventure and

romance which upholds German youth in the midst of bleak and hard reality. Again a hint of good material for American citizenship.

Two notable negative characteristics in the social background of the German immigrant must not be ignored.

One is the palpable lack of opportunity offered in Germany to the young for taking part in organized religious life. This lack is connected with the general backwardness of the German churches in coping with social and moral questions of modern life. To be sure, the World War has in many ways stimulated church activity. Especially in Württemberg there is encouraging evidence of cooperation between the Evangelical Church and young men and women of all classes in organizing work of practical reform. And the same thing happens wherever in Protestant Germany the new Pietism, born from the sufferings of the last ten years, gets a foothold. As for the Catholic Church, it is undoubtedly doing constructive work on a large scale and is constantly making new converts. But neither the Catholic nor the Protestant Church in Germany has so far succeeded in awakening in the young nearly as strong a sense of institutional responsibility or as widely spread a desire to take the initiative in church affairs as exist in America. The German Youth Movement, although deeply religious, is essentially unchurchly.

Similar observations hold good with regard to civic affairs. The German State and the German Communities have for so long been accustomed to the rule by

experts and have reaped from expert rule such invaluable advantages that there seemed to be no need of voluntary and free associations for the promotion of good citizenship. The result has been that until the collapse of the monarchy you heard very little in Germany about civic reform movements, educational campaigns, anti-alcohol leagues, municipal library or hospital drives. Regulations were passed or not passed in these matters by the constituted boards and authorities without the great bulk of the citizens being taken into their confidence. Things are different now. All the great political parties are eager to be heard in the debates on communal problems as well. And large and influential non-partisan organizations, such as the Society for Sport and Gymnastics or the Society for Combating Alcoholism, are constantly appealing to the popular conscience in the name of reason and progress. And yet, even today the average German immigrant will probably be somewhat surprised if soon after his landing here some enthusiast should try to enlist him as member of a Good Government Club. Possibly, he will listen all the more eagerly.

These, then, seem to be the six essential features of the German immigrant background: High degree of systematic schooling, instinctive thrift and orderliness, sense for aesthetically pleasing home surroundings and recreations, strongly developed pride in national achievements, lack of churchliness, lack of experience in political organization.

It may be useful to consider what each of these five inherent characteristics of the German immigrant means

for American citizenship. For in their adaptation to American life, not in their eradication, lies the hope of successful Americanization.

The exceptionally large stock of school information which the German immigrant is likely to bring with him is palpably an exceptional asset for his success in this country. But it is an asset only if it is used for a definite purpose. Possessing information without testing its value by application easily leads to mental self-sufficiency. Widely informed waiters who yet remain waiters are apt to be rather supercilious critics not only of the hotel guests whom they serve but of polite society in general. I cannot help thinking that something of this sort not infrequently happens to the German immigrant. Knowing himself superior in education to a good many of his American-born acquaintances and yet for one reason or another not being able to make his education a stepping stone for advancement, he easily sours on American life and institutions, exalts everything German in comparison, and gradually drifts into narrow cliques of equally malcontent compatriots where "American dollar worship," "American self-advertising," and "American ignorance" receive their daily scourgings. Such unfortunate consequences of a situation originally full of special promise must be avoided. They can be avoided, if the school attainments of the immigrant are benevolently analyzed, if his special intellectual tastes are found out, and if he is given all possible opportunity to develop these special tastes and make them useful for his industrial or business employment and success.

An unmixed blessing to American community life would seem to lie in the German immigrant's traditional orderliness and thrift. One only needs to contrast it with the oft-deplored American shiftlessness and waste in order to realize what a mission these simple virtues have in this country. The difficulty begins as soon as one tries to picture to himself how German thrift and orderliness could be made instruments of American large-scale enterprise. Some compromise between reckless speed and conservative timidity will have to be made by the immigrant, particularly of the peasant class. But in order to save him from throwing all his best instincts overboard, he should be made to feel that he is essentially right in this adherence to ancestral methods, that intelligent people in this country value these methods, that in no sense he needs to be ashamed of them, that on the contrary he will set a good example to the community by trying to regulate his own daily life in accordance with them even in the midst of totally different surroundings.

Similar things are true of what was said about the aesthetic and cultural sensibilities of the German immigrant. No more effective offset against the stupefying movie craze could be imagined than the organization in every American village of a singing society of the type of the German Gesangverein. And no better safeguard against the flimsy vulgarities and ephemeral sensations of the American newspaper could be found than by the spreading of the conservative reading habits of the German immigrant and his adherence to a popular literature which has put within reach of the German masses the

best that the Fatherland contains in art and poetry and thought. American leaders of public reform have here a great opportunity before them. If they succeed in engrafting the German love and practice of song and the German respect for art upon the American masses in general, they will have conferred a boon of incalculable value upon the future of our country.

The frequent aloofness of the German immigrant from church organizations and his usual unfamiliarity with civic affairs are matters which will probably adjust themselves without serious difficulty and within a comparatively brief time; especially since the German churches in this country—both Protestant and Catholic—are doing good work in helping the immigrant to find his social bearings here. Very grave, on the other hand, and of far reaching significance is the question of helping him to adjust his uncommonly highly developed sense of nationality to his new political allegiance. To be sure, the loyalty of German-Americans to American political principles has never been doubtful. Their pride in the national and cultural achievements of the Fatherland has never interfered with their collective enthusiasm for American ideals of freedom, nor has it lessened their readiness for sacrifice in great American emergencies. The question which I have in mind is concerned with the American attitude toward Germany rather than with the German attitude toward America.

I confess that the terms "denationalization" and "renationalization" used in the introductory chapter of this book as descriptive of this process of political adjustment do not seem to me to fit the case. "Denation-

alization" is something entirely negative. It implies no consideration of the value of the nationality from which a given individual is to be shorn: it implies a blind, unthinking abandonment of feelings which may have constituted the best of the individual's former life; it suggests an amputation, a crippling of character rather than strengthening. That is not the kind of accretion to American life which makes us welcome immigration. We do not want immigrants shorn of their nationality, we want immigrants bringing the best of their nationality.

From this point of view, the remarkable afflatus of German national feeling in the 19th century as reflected in the state of mind of the German immigrant of today should be welcomed as an opportunity of seeing him at his height and of helping him to make his highest German feeling the best part of his American patriotism. Americans as a rule have not been very hospitable to this phase of German feeling. Long before the War, when in conversation with President Eliot I urged him to go to Berlin as Harvard exchange professor, he commented upon this suggestion by saying: "I should feel in exile there." I myself, although never failing to call forth a friendly response to my efforts of spreading appreciation of German culture in my adopted country, have always felt, particularly here in New England, that I was facing audiences whose instinctive sympathies had very little to do with Germany. Now that the war fever with all its fantastic exaggerations and misrepresentations has abated, a concerted effort should be made by immigration authorities, social workers, industrial

employers, and teachers to understand what was behind the extraordinary rise of German corporate consciousness of the last hundred years. The German immigrant should be made to feel that he has come to a country where the great events and problems of modern German history—The Napoleonic Wars, the Revolution of 1848, the establishment of the Empire—are correctly understood and where the great German names from Goethe and Frederick to Bismarck and Wagner are justly honored. Nothing could contribute more to his earnest ambition to make himself a true American than to have the country of his birth thus recognized; for he will find therein a stimulus to prove himself worthy of her noble traditions by doing his best in serving his adopted country. Moreover, the record of German achievements in this country should be placed before him as an object of emulation. The lives of Pastorius, Mühlenberg, Steuben, Follen, Lieber, Roebling, Schurz, Henry Villard and many other German-American divines, statesmen, soldiers, scholars, and captains of industry are full of high incentives for young Germans determined to throw in their lot with America. What better augury for their genuine and fruitful Americanization could there be than to have them deliberately and consciously follow in the steps of such pathfinders?

May the combination of high cosmopolitanism and high nationalism which gives to the progressive thought of the new republican Germany such a unique and inspiring quality be typical of the part to be taken by the German immigrant in helping to shape the America of the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A. B. Faust, *The German Element in the United States*, 1909
Rudolf Cronau, *Drei Jahrhunderte deutschen Lebens in Amerika*, 2. Aufl., 1924
Kuno Francke, *German After-war Problems*, 1927, Cambridge

CHAPTER V

THE GREEKS

By HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD,

Author of "Greek Immigration to the United States."

THE existence of the Greek nation today as an independent unit in international affairs is due to the coöperation of three chief factors—language, religion, and the tradition of a glorious past. Throughout many troublous centuries these have been the forces that preserved the sense of unity, and without the sense of unity the fact of unity would have disappeared.

Many factors in the group life of the Greeks tend toward disunity. Foremost among these is the topography of their geographical setting. The word "Greece" may have three meanings. The first refers to a rugged peninsula stretching down into the Mediterranean. The second indicates the territory included within the confines of the Greek political unit at any particular time. The third signifies simply the home of the Greek people. The last of these is much the most vital, for from classical times down to the present the culture of the Greeks has so dominated the regions in which they were numerous as to bind them all into one coherent body. Greek history would lose much of its significance if there were

excluded the Ionian coast, the shores of the Bosphorus and the Black Sea, certain districts in Italy and north Africa, and scores of scattered islands of greater or lesser importance.

But this very diversity of physical setting has laid a heavy strain on the ties that bind the Greeks together. The peninsula itself (to which most of what follows particularly applies) is broken up into a large number of small habitation districts, separated from each other by frowning mountain barriers or far-reaching arms of the sea. Before the days of modern means of communication the various portions of this area, itself no larger than West Virginia, were practically farther apart than New York and Athens are today, and the Greek world as a whole was larger than the entire modern world. Thus any continuous coöperation between the Greeks of Epiros, Attica, and Sparta, to say nothing of those in remoter regions, was out of the question. Consequently the sense of immediate group loyalty among the Greeks has always been very restricted in its scope. Even today, in spite of many miles of good railroad and improved roads, much of the communication still depends upon bridle paths, and the denizens of one little mountain nook or valley feel a distinct sense of alienation toward those on the other side of the range.

Another feature of the topography that has had a profound influence on Greek character and history is the extensive coast line, with its many excellent harbors. Hemmed in and restricted on the mainland, the Greek has always looked with friendly eyes upon the beckon-

ing sea. The paths of freedom, glory, and wealth have ever led outward. Thus there has developed a strong strain of independence and individualism in the Greek character. Coupled with this, however, there is an intense patriotism which marks the Greek wherever he is found. As a result, loyalty to his people sometimes outruns his capacity for practical coöperation.

A second disintegrating force has been racial intermixture. The basic stock of the Greek people is the Pelasgian branch of that Mediterranean race which was the first to people the continent of Europe, and still underlies roughly half of its population. This is a normally slender, long-headed, brunet type, artistic and vivid in disposition. But infusions of other blood began very early. The Hellenes themselves were a group of invaders from the north, also long-headed, but blue-eyed, blond-haired, and fair-skinned. Bringing with them the germs of a new culture, they established themselves as the dominant element in the Greek life, and laid the foundations for that matchless efflorescence of civilization which is still the priceless heritage of the Greek people. But they were not sufficiently numerous to make a lasting impress upon the Greek physical stock, and blondness is very rare, though very much admired, today.

With the decline of the Greek military and political power there set in a long period of assaults upon the racial unity of the people. One invader after another, Goths, Vandals, Avars, Slavs, Albanians, and finally Turks, imposed themselves in larger or smaller num-

bers and for longer or shorter stretches of time upon the defenseless people. Each such incursion inevitably left some sediment in the way of racial infusion. During the long and dreadful domination of the Turk there was unavoidably considerable mixture of stock. As a consequence, today the Greek people is undeniably a much blended body, and if racial purity had been the sole basis of coherence the name Greek would have become merely a memory long ago.

Fortunately, there were at work during this dark period some of the most powerful forces of nationality. Foremost among these stands language. What is now known as the Greek language was presumably a part of the culture which characterized the Hellenes, though very possibly it reached Greece, as a part of the remarkable expansion of Aryan culture, some time before the arrival of the blond invaders themselves. There is no need to dwell upon its remarkable grace, dignity, and adaptability to fine distinctions of thought, nor to emphasize the unique influence it has had on the development of western civilization. For our purposes, the significant fact is that it eventually supplanted whatever language the aborigines had originally spoken as the medium of communication of all classes of true Greeks. It is not to be supposed, however, that in so doing it did not suffer considerable modification. Indeed, it can hardly be imagined that the common people ever spoke in the diction of Aeschylus, Homer, or Aristotle. Moreover, during the long centuries of national submergence still further changes inevitably took place. Many foreign words of Turkish, Albanian, Italian and other

origin crept in. In accordance with a general tendency, the grammar degenerated, becoming simpler and more practical, but losing in precision and flexibility.

As a consequence, there exists today two distinct, and to a very large extent different, Greek languages. One, the "high" Greek, or "*Ellenika*," is the language of literature, learning, and formal address; the other, the "low" Greek, or "*Roumaika*," is the medium of everyday conversation. Educated people know both, though they usually speak the latter, in its less crude forms. Illiterate persons know only low Greek. So different are the two that an uneducated peasant cannot understand the modern Greek translation of the New Testament when it is read to him. These facts have afforded a very great obstacle to the recent efforts to build up a genuine literature in the vernacular, which have, notwithstanding, produced some very admirable results in the way of poetry and fiction. In spite of all diversities, however, the natural and original use of the Greek language is the best single mark of identification of the true Greek. Finally, it should be added that the modern pronunciation of Greek is so different from the "Erasmian" pronunciation taught in the schools of America and England that the latter creates the greatest amusement or ridicule. There is a story that the great English statesman, Gladstone, who was an excellent Greek scholar, was once invited to address an eminent Greek audience, and seized the opportunity to make use of his learning by addressing them in his choicest Greek. At the close of his speech there was great applause, and his hearers crowded about him, express-

ing their delight in having at last heard the eminent Englishman speak in his own beautiful language.

The second persistent force in preserving the Greek nationality was religion. Every Greek is born into his religion—the Greek Orthodox or Eastern Catholic Church—and he could scarcely conceive of leaving it or denying his affiliation with it any more than of ceasing to be a Greek. The Greek church differs from the Roman not only in important matters of doctrine and dogma, but also in its ritual and forms of worship. One of the chief grounds of schism between the two was the matter of images. To the Greek a statue in the round, or in complete relief, savors of idolatry. In its place is substituted the “eikon” which may be largely in relief, but always has a flat face and often flat hands. Pictures of these kinds, representing various saints, play a large part in Greek worship. They are distributed abundantly in the churches, where they are reverently kissed by the worshippers. Every devout home also has its eikon.

In the formal church services the language handicap is very prominent. The ritual is read in the ancient language, so that the average attendant gets not one word of meaning from it. The real effect of the service therefore consists in cultivating a certain emotional state or attitude of mind. This is fostered by the beautiful architecture and decoration of many of the churches, by the use of incense, ceremonial, insignia, and chants. Since nationality is so largely a matter of feeling, this is the really important thing as regards the preservation of Greek unity. The loyalty so characteristic of the

Greek emphatically includes his religion. The essential forms are rigorously observed, and no slurring allusion by an outsider is tolerated.

One important respect in which the Greek church differs from the Roman is that the regular priests are married, and live a normal family life as members of the community. There are also celibate monks who devote their lives to the work of the monasteries, which provide an interesting and often very picturesque phase of Greek religious life.

The third factor in the maintenance of Greek identity was the golden classical tradition. Of the supreme worthiness of this national heritage there is no need to speak. Western culture is eloquent on that theme. What concerns us is that this national memory was kept vigorously alive in many ways, notably by the existence of innumerable monuments of past achievement, though long ago reduced to ruins. Any Greek landscape is likely to display the remnants of a temple, a ruined theatre, or at least a group of fallen columns, superb in their artistry. In Athens the Parthenon remained virtually intact in all its matchless splendor until in 1687 the attacking Venetians dropped a shell into the powder magazine which the Turks had established in its midst. Even today the capital city abounds in varied mementos of its ancient glory, the most perfectly preserved being the temple of Theseus.

To the modern Greek, the intimate and unbroken association that he feels with all this past achievement establishes a special claim of his people upon the rest of western civilization, and—what is more important—

sets up standards of conduct which help to direct his life wherever he may be. One of the favorite practices of successful Greeks who have made fortunes in some foreign land is to erect in Athens some monument that will serve to intensify this connection of the present with the past. One of the most notable of these is the rebuilt stadium in which the revived Olympic Games were held. Nothing could be a more vivid reminder of this continuity than the perpetuation of classic personal names, such as Aristotle, Epaminondas, Pericles, etc. Thus the sentiment of loyalty among the Greeks covers a longer stretch of time, probably, than in the case of any other European people.

As a consequence of this complex of forces, when at last the time came, early in the nineteenth century, to throw off the Turkish yoke, there still remained a Greek nationality, disorganized and confused, to be sure, but yet sufficiently homogeneous and self-conscious to act as a unit. The contrast between the miserable cluster of tumble-down huts that was Athens at that time and the magnificent modern city that surrounds the Acropolis today is the best possible testimony to the inherent vitality, determination, and resourcefulness of the Greek people.

The economic life of modern Greece rests fundamentally upon an agricultural and commercial basis. The principal products are currants, wheat, olives, figs, corn, hashish, and tobacco. Domestic animals of various kinds are also raised. The commerce is largely of a maritime character; shipping has been a mainstay of Greek life from time immemorial. Since the World

War certain important changes have taken place. Manufacturing industries have been developed, depending largely upon supplies of lignite for their power. The exchange of population between Greece and Turkey has had two important economic effects. It has extended the cultivation of tobacco, and it has introduced the rug industry of the genuine Turkish type; this latter development is full of promise for Greece, and for art-loving people everywhere.

Agricultural methods are still rather primitive. Much of the cultivation is still done by hand, while wooden plows drawn by diminutive oxen are in common use. The reaping and threshing are largely done by hand, though of course in all these particulars changes are taking place in the direction of more modern methods, and much agricultural machinery has recently been imported.

The scarcity of economic resources in comparison to the population finds many visible expressions. The food of the common people is simple, consisting mainly of bread, olives, cheese and other milk products, tomatoes, lettuce and other vegetables, with meat as an occasional luxury. But it is fresh and wholesome, and in their opinion much preferable to the boxed foods available in such variety elsewhere. During the period of heavy emigration women and girls could be seen doing the hardest manual work, as in the construction of buildings and roads. Thousands of little boys, employed under the "padrone system," throng the streets of the cities, blacking boots, carrying messages, and

otherwise contributing to the income of the family hundreds of miles away.

Social life in Greece presents many contrasts. There are, in the first place, the few large cities, particularly Athens and Patras, where the mode of life is patterned closely upon the "French" model. Here, as far as the general externals of life are concerned, one might be in almost any European capital. At the other extreme, there is the predominant agricultural population, from which the bulk of emigration is drawn. Here, daily life is essentially an out-door affair. The houses are mainly small, one-story affairs, often with dirt floors, but well built and offering numerous advantages over the tenement flats which customarily fall to the lot of the average Greek immigrant in the United States for instance. There is abundant yard room around them, and various household tasks such as baking and washing are carried on under the open sky. The occupations of the men—tilling the soil, cultivating the vineyards, or tending flocks of sheep or goats—necessarily keep them out of doors.

There is a great deal of charm about the Greek family life. Marriage arrangements are still concluded on the basis of the dowry system. Young girls from the more remote districts can be seen with caps of gold coins, and strings of the same about their necks, signifying what they have to contribute in a material way to the success of a new home, while young men display an admirable devotion and faithfulness in postponing their own marital ventures until they have satisfactorily mar-

ried off their sisters. The abundant and useful tasks of the housewife leave no space for the restless discontent so familiar among women in more sophisticated societies.

Music and dancing play a large part in the recreations of the Greeks. Music seems to be ingrained in their character. The native music is of a distinctly oriental type, full of cadences and minor melodies, unfamiliar to the Anglo-Saxon ear, bursting forth spontaneously and delightfully from the lips of the cabman, the bootblack, and the shepherd on the hillside. The folk dancing, which is largely performed in the open, is usually done by men individually, though sometimes in groups that may include both sexes. Some of the most enjoyable social occasions are furnished by certain religious celebrations held on fixed days in the calendar, that draw participants from a wide radius, and afford opportunity for many forms of recreation and relaxation. Holidays occupy a large place in Greek life, often to the serious inconvenience of foreign business men who are accustomed to a continuous and rigid schedule. These holidays are mainly of a religious character. In addition to the usual Christian celebrations, Christmas, Easter, etc., every important saint has his day. It is customary for each individual named after one of the saints to observe particularly his "name-day," which is much more important than his birth-day. As a result, on some of the popular name-days business comes practically to a standstill. There are also certain important fast seasons prescribed by the Church.

In these country districts the dress is still distinctive.

The ordinary costume of the men consists of a sort of smock with long trousers, but on gala occasions they don a heavily pleated white kilt, gaily embroidered jacket, and leggings, and tasseled cap, while the women appear in flowing garments richly decorated with hand-work of various kinds, with gay scarfs over their heads.

Sports of the more vigorous athletic type do not characteristically appeal to the Greek. Rather does he prefer to walk with his friends out into the country for a picnic meal, with possibly a kid roasted whole as a special treat, or to sit at a table in front of one of the ubiquitous coffee houses, or most of all to spend an hour or two in one of the semi-public gardens that form one of the most alluring features of Greek life, with the sound of running water in his ears, sipping his black coffee or resinated wine, and bursting into song if the mood seizes him.

Among the devotees of various sports in the United States it is a common ground of speculation whether this or that notable figure can "come back." The Greeks have proved that a nationality can "come back." Clinging with singular tenacity to their essential unity through a long period of submergence, they have now reinstated themselves among the family of nations. Industry, commerce, and a characteristic culture have been revived. A compulsory system of common education is becoming effective, and higher learning has been put on a lofty level. A native literature is making its way. A democratic form of government—the only one consistent with the innate Greek character and disposition—is being substituted in spite of difficulties for the dis-

carded monarchical régime. The time has passed when any small nation can be expected again to reach the dominating pinnacle of world culture, but there is every hope that Greece will eventually establish a self-contained national life that will both justify the ancient tradition, and make reliance upon it less necessary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Thomas Burgess, *Greeks in America*, 1913

Henry Pratt Fairchild, *Greek Immigration to the United States*, 1911

Aristides Phoutrides and Demetra Vaka Brown, *Modern Greek Stories*, 1920

CHAPTER VI

THE HUNGARIANS

By JOSEPH REMENYI,

Novelist, Essayist, Lecturer; editorial writer of the "Hungarian Daily" of Cleveland.

IN speaking about the Hungarian (Magyar) immigrants' background, the fundamental point of view that should be considered is this: the Hungarians are predominantly an emotional people. Irrespective of the education or lack of education that characterizes their mental equipment, the fact remains that their incidental or conscious actions are first of all directed by emotions of imaginative significance. Whoever knows Hungarian music, which varies from other types in pensive and dynamic motives, agrees with the veracity of the above statement. The emotionalism of the Hungarian people is not merely a sentimental reflection of their innermost self. It is rational in the sense that it suggests an innate sense of living. Nothing could be more rational than a desire to live and not to theorize about life. The average Hungarian instinctively looks upon life as a colorful adventure and not as a round of burdensome duty, although he has a sense of duty. Even Hungarians who are Calvinists, and therefore accept predestination as dogmatic truth, on account of

their temperament contradict the determining principle of the inevitableness of destiny.

The same problem that the Hungarians have encountered in Europe for the past one thousand years because of their Asiatic traditions, is even more accentuated in their American environment. What was and what is still the essential problem of Hungary in her relationship to the outside world? To adjust the emotional handicap of the east to the opportunistic conditions of the west. In other words to become rational not in a philosophical but in an economic sense. To compromise with dreams for the sake of schemes.

The Hungarians arrived in Europe in the year 896 A.D. as the last group of the migration from Asia which started with the Huns. Their leaders decided to settle down on the shores of the Danube. Their main task was to curb the nomadic habits of their people. In the year 1000 Hungary accepted western European civilization by adopting Christianity. And although for one thousand years Hungary served culture and progress in a western European sense, winning and being defeated in battles fought in the defense of organized Christianity as well as for her national existence, nevertheless in the subconscious self of the people restless shadows of the pagan gods of their ancestors caused uneasiness; a feeling that alienated them from the west without bringing them nearer to the east. Hungarian literature, art, folklore, and the superstitions of the unsophisticated peasants show convincingly this friction between the racial past and political present. As a psychological phenomenon it is interesting to observe that while various

peoples of similar or entirely different racial backgrounds settled down in Hungary and that wars and intermarriages extinguished the racial purity of the Hungarian people, yet the Hungarianized foreigners quite often absorbed the imaginative emotionalism of the Hungarians, sometimes at the expense of their practical self. What was once a racial trait developed into a national trait.

In spite of the fact that there are only scattered homogeneous groups of Hungarians in America—certain units for instance which migrated from the same county and by seeking occupation in the same community lessened the strangeness of their new surrounding—the bulk of the American Hungarians is alike in that respect that they react with an almost equal intensive emotionalism to the impressions that America offers them. Industrial and commercial civilization in America is more predominant than in their native land and more pronounced than in Germany or France where skilled Hungarian workers have often found occupation and appreciation. Naturally, differences in degree of intelligence, and consequently the depth of judgment, divide the various types of Hungarian immigrants. However, those who cling to their national traditions as well as those who have outgrown them or hardly ever felt them resemble each other when their spontaneous selves seek happiness in America. To overcome the handicap of surplus emotions is the main difficulty of the Hungarian immigrant's adjustment to American life.

The spiritual isolation of the Hungarian people in

the European surrounding is partly a result of the nature of the Hungarian language, which differs from every European tongue. Etymologists trace back the language of the Finns and of the Hungarians to a common source which, from a practical standpoint, has no significant value, as the two peoples cannot understand each other. Another theory endeavors to prove the relationship of the Hungarian language to the Turkish language, but without visible results. All such combinations have only a linguistic significance. In reality in his native tongue no Hungarian could approach a Turk. The loneliness of the Hungarian language in the midst of the European Babel led to an ideology of conservatism that even today influences the thinking of the average Hungarian. Being more dependent upon themselves than the peoples of western Europe, the uniqueness of their language developed a strong bond between them despite the differences of their political, social and religious creeds. A Hungarian knows that no foreigner, living outside of Hungary, will learn Hungarian unless he is a linguist particularly interested in the group of languages to which Hungarian belongs, or unless he learns it for business reasons (also an exceptional case). The isolation of the Hungarian language produced a certain stubborn pride. Foreigners often judge this as harshness, whereas it is rather a form of collective sensitiveness.

In matters of religion about two-thirds of the Hungarians are Roman Catholics, a small number are Greek Catholics, a very large percentage Calvinists and the rest are Lutherans, Unitarians, Jews and a small per-

cent of them Baptists. When reformation began, Hungary struggled with the absolutistic aims and methods of the Habsburgs. As a protest deriving from a growing racial self-consciousness a great many Hungarians were converted to Calvinism because in the Catholicism of the ruling family of the Habsburgs, they saw a denationalizing tendency and in Calvinism a weapon against that policy. Of course the oppressed classes had no rights. Because of their economic and social dependence there was no other course for them but to follow the privileged classes in their faith. One result was a certain neglect of artistic beauty expressed not only in the equipment of the churches but in the furniture of their homes and in the color of their garments. But their inborn disposition for cheerful colors, especially for red and blue, was so deeply rooted that even the Puritan tendencies of Protestantism could only dim but not obliterate it. Protestantism democratized to a certain extent the social life of the Hungarian people; on the other hand Catholicism kept alive their aesthetic traditions. Moreover, the fact that the majority of the Hungarians is still Catholic proves not only their adherence to their religion for dogmatic reasons; it also proves a conservatism that resists the alteration of accepted principles. In addition to this it shows that their emotions are imaginative and elastic when dealing with joys and sorrows of life that are comprehensible and human like love, but that they are static with respect to questions of transcendental perspective or ideas foreign to their mentality.

The political system of Hungary suggests close affli-

ation with the psychology of the religion of the people. Present-day Hungary is a monarchy without a King. The country has monarchistic traditions. It is true that Hungary had revolutionary movements in the past, but they were frustrated. Religion convinces its followers of the necessity of authority, of centralized power. The religious self of the Hungarian people is not fanatical, but balanced. So is its political self in the question of monarchy. While seeking a ruler, the Hungarians want a constitutional King. The King is also a symbol of unity, a seeming guarantee of economic safety and, finally, an ornament of national glory. The problem of a King for Hungary is still unsettled. At present a Regent is the head of the country. The parliament is divided into two parts: the upper house and the lower house. The members of the upper house are appointed by the Regent or elected by different denominations, vocations, institutions, and social classes; those of the lower house are elected by the people. Most of the American Hungarians lived under a different political system which excluded a great many of them from the right of voting. Despite the unfairness of the franchise-system of Hungary in pre-war times, the average Hungarian was greatly interested in politics.

There is a curious mixture of modesty and impulsiveness in the Hungarian people which finds tangible expression in an enlarged form of local patriotism. In its final development, this becomes a sort of instinct for national self-preservation. The typical Hungarian is very much attached to his village or town and in the same way to his country. His political conscience is a

dimensionally, but not substantially, strengthened local patriotism. His political interest is modest in its scope but impulsive in its manifestation. Hungary's historical task was—being wedged between the east and the west—to be on the defense while serving her national existence as well as culture in general. This constant "*en garde*" attitude deepened national self-consciousness; it set a higher value on the treasured spot where one was born and it resulted sometimes in an almost exaggerated form of patriotism which, however, never lacked sincerity. Thus, frequently, the patriotic self-assurance of a Hungarian shapes his political views.

Hungary, considerably reduced from her original territory, is an agricultural country. The industry of the country received a severe blow from the peace treaty of Trianon. With the exception of Budapest and a few cities where there are factories and large industrial plants, there is hardly any worthwhile industry in the country. Most of the industrial cities of old Hungary are now under foreign rule. A few coal mines remain of the numerous other mines that Hungary once had. Logically, the economic system of the country is consistent with its agricultural features. It registers strong class differences, an almost feudal aspect which, nevertheless, seems to be in accordance with the basic psychology of a large percentage of the Hungarian people. The landowner (aristocrat and gentry) and the landowning peasant are the backbone of the nation. This was the case in the past too, but today it is even more pronounced. This system produced and still produces a large number of landless peasants whose economic

status is extremely low. Most of the American Hungarians left their country because they could not satisfy their hunger for land. In fairness to present-day Hungary it should be stated that certain tendencies in the direction of land-reform are indicating the possible remedy of this situation. It is obvious that the most important internal problem of the country is the establishment of an economic equilibrium suitable to the conditions of modern times. The economic status of the industrial worker—especially if skilled—is somewhat better than that of the land-starved peasant, but not enviable either. Before the mutilation of Hungary the economic status of the industrial worker was almost on the level of the western European worker. Because often the worker could apply his skill and initiative, he had a certain measure of satisfaction which at times compensated him for his not always sufficient wages. Referring to the manufacturers and merchants of Hungary, in pre-war times, their influence was growing parallel with the industrial and commercial progress of the country; but now on account of economic instability—a consequence of the World War—their sad plight is undeniable. As for the professional element, their fate is tragical. For the past few decades Hungary has been over-populated with educated men, and more today than ever before is this over-preponderance of them a tragic burden for the country which is unable to support them. Since the end of the World War a great percentage of the Hungarian immigrants is represented by this class.

A religious, political, and economic system, such as

described above, evolves a moral code of its own character. The idea of centralized authority, complemented by an atavistic sense of respect and fear of dignitaries, leads to a moral conception that is based on the prestige of paternalism. Hence the twofold sense of responsibility that characterizes the average Hungarian; one to his family self, the other to his national self. The first one makes him reliable as a worker, the second one interesting as a dreamer. The first one keeps him on earth; the second one broadens his vision, even should he be—intellectually speaking—inarticulate. It is pathetic to see, for instance, the suffering of a poverty-stricken Hungarian if he cannot support his family, and his grief for the fate of his nation, although the nation might have had no consideration for him. He must believe in a tangible and intangible power because his human self-respect is such as demands a belief in himself too. While respecting a visible (parenthood) and an invisible (the genius of the nation) authority, he himself feels the need to impress himself as an authority in some shape or form. This explains, for example, the autocratic attitude which Hungarian fathers frequently display toward their children and which, in an American environment, often estranges the children from their fathers. This explains the severity with which often a Hungarian husband treats his wife. And this explains his resentment for charity if out of work, because his sense of human dignity (authority), feels humbled by receiving something for which he cannot offer anything. No doubt, the moral code of the Hungarian people is based on the sense of obligation, re-

liability, confidence, mutual respect and sometimes on an overstressed conception of obedience, discipline or dignity of social standing.

However, this strongly expressed ethical self of the Hungarian people does not interfere with those features and functions of life which require imaginative emotions. While admitting that family institutions are often autocratic, that the husband attributes rights to himself which overstep those bounds to which he is entitled by the law, that the economic status of the woman is still dependent, although her social status has considerably improved, while admitting that a child in a Hungarian home enjoys or abuses less freedom than the American child and that divorce necessitates more substantial reasons than in America, the law being fairer to the husband than to the wife, yet the serenity and severity of this moral code assisted by the law does not destroy the joyful aspects of Hungarian life. The Hungarian is too conscious of the beauty and pleasant duty of actual living, to submit himself to moral codes when they deteriorate into artificiality. He accepts the sovereignty of morality in accordance with his disposition, but he prefers the majesty of living. This latter point of view is seen in the dress of the Hungarian peasant which is colorful, in the embroidery of Hungarian peasant women which shows the splendid fairy-tale-like imagination of the people; it is seen in the ornamentation of their walls, in the carvings of their furniture, in the useful and beautifying equipment of their homes and in their cleanliness, in folksongs and churchsongs, in the sprightliness of their dances, in their fables and anec-

dotes which suggest whimsicality and a certain broad understanding of human frailty. They like wine. They like outdoor sports such as swimming, regattas, skating and soccer-football. The higher social classes enjoy tennis and fencing. The Hungarians are fond of nature. In spite of their imaginative disposition, the superstitions of the people are rather naïve than foolish. Due to their conscious application of social discrimination, their manners are polite, sometimes reverential and they show a marked consideration for older people. The frequent holidays of the Catholics are not merely an opportunity for religious exercises, but for recreation of a secular character too. There are few national festivals, but they signify a collective experience of the people. The three stations of existence, birth, wedding and death, are occasions for conspicuous demonstrations of their emotional instincts.

The bulk of the American Hungarians is devoid of higher education because of the background of their social and economic status. Hungary for a long time had a splendid standard of higher education but compulsory education is a relatively new feature of Hungarian life. Therefore there is a considerable number of illiterates among the Hungarian peasants. Their number is gradually diminishing. The present-day elementary school system of Hungary tries to eliminate the number of illiterates as much as possible. In the past higher education stressed the acquisition of abstract knowledge more than today. The trade schools of Hungary are of high reputation, as are the schools of agriculture, the universities, commercial academies and

institutions exclusively in the service of science. The social standing of an educator is good, but the salaries are not in keeping with the significance of teaching.

It is only natural that a people endowed with such emotional and imaginative resources as the Hungarians should have a wealth of music, art and literature. The compositions of Liszt—some medleys of Hungarian folksongs—popularized Hungarian music in foreign lands and so did the gipsy musicians, those romantic accompaniments of Hungarian life without whom no genuine Hungarian entertainment is possible. Yet the conscious artistic development of the musical material of Hungary is still in process, indicating that the world may expect new sensations from the musical genius of the Hungarian people. Modern Hungarian composers are introducing in a unique way into their compositions almost lost motives of Hungarian melodies. Here it should suffice to mention the names of Bela Bartok and Zoltan Kodaly. In the field of art—especially painting and acting—Hungary is also contributing her share to the general artistic culture of mankind. The painters are known to the art connoisseurs everywhere. Every school is represented in Hungarian art. The multitudinous colors of Hungarian folkgarments, atmospheric and genre scenes, can be observed on many of their paintings. The scope of Hungarian actors is narrowed to the Hungarian stage because of the restriction of the Hungarian language. Indeed, Hungarian interpretative and creative art can be measured in terms of international relationship.

This can be said about Hungarian literature also. If

literature is the most perfect manifestation of a people's spiritual consciousness—which it should be—then Hungarian literature, unquestionably, represents a high standard of thinking and feeling, beautifully and sincerely expressed. Hungarian poetry and bellettristic prose is more profound than the drama and literary criticism. In the case of a nation struggling for its existence to the extent that Hungary did and does, literature is an inevitable and indispensable guide of the people. Because of the tragical fate of the country, Hungarian writers wage a terrific battle not merely for their literary integrity, but for their very existence. Gradually Hungarian plays and novels are translated into foreign languages. These writers offer foreigners the possibility of understanding some phases of the background of that people which in spite of its one-thousand year existence in Europe, and its large representation in America, is still in need of unbiased comprehension and understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Armin Vambery, *Hungary in Ancient and Modern Times*, 1897
Emil Reich, *Hungarian Literature*, 1898
Frederick Riedl, *History of Hungarian Literature*, 1909

CHAPTER VII

THE IRISH

By CHARLES A. BENNETT,

Professor of Philosophy, Yale University. Author and essayist.

IRELAND is geographically one. As for her national life, she has been one nation in the past and she may be again one nation in the future. Both the tradition and aspiration are real and potent. But in the actual present there are, politically speaking, two Irelands: The Irish Free State and The Government of Northern Ireland. Northern Ireland in the political sense does not, as is often erroneously thought, coincide with the whole province of Ulster: it comprises only the six counties of Antrim, Down, Armagh, Fermanagh, Tyrone, and Londonderry. The remaining 36 counties constitute the territory of The Free State. From the point of view of national background a political division like this might have little significance. The national consciousness might ignore or transcend it. Indeed, one of the gravest problems in Irish life today is that, thanks to the politicians who did violence to spiritual realities when they hacked out the boundaries of Northern Ireland, there are considerable sections of the population in the six counties who by race, religion, and national aspiration have all their affinities with the Free State

and are yet compelled to live under the alien government of Northern Ireland.

But although it is thus true that the line of political cleavage does not mark a cultural distinction yet the fact that there are two governments in Ireland does express vividly the truth that, culturally speaking, there are two Irelands. The thing might be illustrated in this way. Suppose you were to ask a man where he comes from and he says Ireland. Unless his accent has already betrayed him you will have learned little. You must ask him another: "What part of Ireland?" If the reply is Belfast, the chances are that he is a stout Presbyterian, fearful if not contemptuous of the practices of Rome, a shrewd business man and proud of it, intensely loyal to the British Flag and the Imperial Connection, thrifty, efficient, cautious, reserved, not given to enthusiasms, slow to make friends. In short, a solid man, if a little hard; prosaic, perhaps, but with a keen eye for the material actualities, with a gospel of hard work and success and a corresponding indifference to the world of the imagination. If the reply is Dublin or Cork then it is a different story altogether. You probably have before you a Roman Catholic, but not a bigoted one, a strong believer in "Ireland a Nation," with a vague but massive sense that all his country's troubles have been due to the iniquities of British rule, a man of the open country and the farms, genial, warm-hearted, unsophisticated, neither successful nor interested in success as the world understands it, ready to drop his day's work to go fishing with you or for the chance of a drink, a smoke, and a talk. That is of course an over-simple

sketch, and a sketch that will have to be increasingly modified in the coming years as the consequences of self-government and political responsibility begin to tell on the life and character of the southern Irish, yet on the whole it is a true indication of the two Irelands. In what follows I shall have chiefly in mind the second.

The American's understanding of the Irish, of their gifts, their limitations, and their general philosophy of life, is hampered by the prevalence of that conventional picture of the Irishman for which the stage, the illustrated papers, and the stock jokes about Pat and Mike are largely responsible. One would think that by this time there are so many people of Irish descent distributed over the United States it was possible for anyone to form his judgment from direct acquaintance with actual specimens. But as a matter of fact the picture is more powerful than the original. The so-called type is substituted for the reality. Thus people will laugh at a remark by an Irishman which is funny neither in intent nor effect because "we all know" that famous Irish sense of humor, and so, by Heaven, that remark *must* have been funny. They divine a twinkle in the most solemn gaze. In the same way, what in another person would be damned as irresponsibility is in an Irishman taken as a symptom of delightful waywardness. "These charming people!" How I hate that idea of Irish charm. I feel about it as one of the characters in E. M. Forster's book *A Passage to India* seems to feel about the spirituality of India. "I don't consider us spiritual. We can't co-ordinate, we can't co-ordinate, it only comes to that. We can't keep en-

gements, we can't catch trains. What more than this is the so-called spirituality of India?"

Let us then look at this conventional picture and see how much truth and how much falsehood it contains. We can say roughly that it represents the Irishman as (among other things) :

1. Intensely patriotic.
2. Having a talent for making friends.
3. Having a strong sense of humor.
4. Lazy and happy-go-lucky.

1. The strength and intensity of the national feeling is to be explained as the effect of many causes: of geographical separateness, of language, of religion. The influence and the importance of these is a theme full of interesting problems, but Irish nationalism as a conscious sentiment today depends, I think, chiefly on the three following factors. First, the tradition of a noble past, the epic age of kings and courts and warriors, of gold and fine raiment and heroic Bards to sing them, and that later age when Ireland was the Island of Saints and her schools and monasteries were a source of light to lighten the Dark Ages of Europe. Vague and sentimental, perhaps, but the nation cannot become an ideal unless it can be invested with such glamour. Secondly, the Literary Revival of the last thirty or forty years, a movement which, finding its first inspiration in the rediscovery of the ancient heroic literature has produced and continues to produce poetry, drama and other forms of art that can hold their own with anything done elsewhere in the same period.

Within the last few years the Nobel Prize for Literature has twice been awarded to Irish authors. (William Butler Yeats and George Bernard Shaw). They are the crests of a goodly wave. Thirdly, and most important, the historic struggle against England. When all is said and done it is this factor that has given form and substance to the national idea as a moving force in the minds of the Irish. The national good has for centuries been thought of in terms of political independence, and independence, in turn, has meant the throwing off of British rule. Of course there have been periods of temporary adjustment with England and again times when the national spirit seemed almost extinguished, but the flame has never wholly died. It has always been there ready to be fanned into a conflagration. *

We are here concerned to trace the influences of this kind of national feeling on the character and general outlook of those who share it. To begin with, the struggle against England has been a record of continual frustration and defeat, of hope deferred until hope dies. And so, just as in ages of world weariness men's minds revert to a Golden Age, so the mind of the Irish patriot has tended to live in his country's glorious past, trying to borrow from it some of its lustre to conceal the unlovely present. But too much of this kind of brooding unfits one for perceiving, still more for performing, the job that lies under one's hand. The feats of Cuchullain or St. Patrick are good to contemplate, but not if the contemplation makes you forget that the slums of Dublin are the foulest imaginable. Again,

Irish patriotism has been traditionally of the belligerent sort, showing itself conspicuously in acts of hate and destruction towards the enemy rather than in the building up of the national life. The greater part of the political and constructive energies of the people have in the past been absorbed by or forgotten in the one national aspiration of becoming free from English rule. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that English Rule has been the scapegoat upon which the Irish have heaped their own sins of omission. The problems of Agriculture, of Education, of Housing, of Industry, have all been neglected in Ireland because Ireland's shocking backwardness in these departments of life was supposed to be the result of iniquitous English dominion. "When we get Home Rule" or "When we get the Republic" everything was to be different. Thus what might have been done was postponed until the Day of Freedom should have dawned. As one effect of patriotism was to make the Irishman live in the past, so the other was to make him live in the future. The present suffered.

This I think is the right explanation of Irish inertia, as opposed on the one hand to those who take it as an ultimate fact of Irish character and so not further explicable and on the other hand to those who attribute it to climate. That it is not inherent is proved—if proof were necessary—by the notorious fact that Irishmen do well everywhere but in Ireland. As for climate, well, it is true that the climate of Ireland is extremely enervating and you have to drink tea at least six times a day to keep yourself going at all, but the North of Ireland

manages to be fairly industrious and for continuous relaxing weather the Thames Valley and other parts of the South of England are hard to beat. No, if the Irishman is conspicuously lazy it is because he has formed the bad habit of saying, Let George (i.e., The British Government) do it.

This lack of a sense of political responsibility works itself out in a way which should interest observers of the part played by the Irish in the American scene. Take a country like Ireland which throughout the greater part of its history has either had no self-government at all or the mere shadow of it in the form of a group of representatives in the British Parliament at Westminster whose main function was so to jockey for position among British parties as to extract Home Rule from reluctant hands—there you have a situation where there is no public opinion, for the simple reason that there is no way in which public opinion can make itself effective, no political organ for it to work on or with. That means that all political affairs which do not involve the major national issue will be dealt with in private rather than in public fashion. Politics becomes an affair of personal promises and bargainings and understandings and arrangements. And so if you have certain gifts of personality, if you are genial, engaging, plausible, persuasive, if you know the arts of blandishment and cajolery and blarney—and so many Irishmen do—here they are at a premium. The Irishman's flair for politics, then, as Americans have come to know it in municipal life is to be explained not so much by "a genius for friendship" as by the fact that the political con-

ditions in his own country have given him extended opportunity to become adept in a certain kind of political technique.

2. To that "genius for friendship" I now turn. The thing that this phrase is usually meant to indicate I should prefer to describe differently, in negative rather than positive terms. Let me suggest "lacking in a feeling for the formal or official relationship." In public life men become related to one another in various more or less formal *capacities*: pastor and flock, teacher and pupil, doctor and patient, master and servant, and so on. With each such connection there goes the appropriate formality of address, manner, costume, observance of one kind or another. The great advantage of thus distinguishing the private or personal from the official rôle is that the burden of life is eased. If I speak severely to a pupil about his work and we both understand that I am speaking as teacher to him as pupil then our personal relations (which may be quite friendly) remain unimpaired. If he calls me Sir and he and I both wear cap and gown in the class-room it is all the easier to keep this distinction in mind. If the distinction is not observed and if every transaction between myself and my pupils is a personal affair then impartial criticism becomes impossible, susceptibilities may be wounded, life becomes unbearably complex. By a feeling for the official relationship I mean a sense for and an observance of what the occasion requires. Now it is a lack of just this which is at once the most exasperating and the most engaging characteristic of the Irishman in one's dealings with him. A trivial example.

Some years ago I was motoring in Ireland in a hired car. On a lonely country road three miles from the nearest village and telephone the car broke down. The driver was about to set out on foot for the village when a telegraph boy on his bicycle came along. On request he willingly lent his bicycle to the driver. The boy and I sat by the roadside and talked while we waited (about three quarters of an hour) for the driver's return. Suddenly it occurred to me to ask the boy if he had a telegram to deliver. "Oh, yes," he said, "but there's no hurry." Of course it was infinitely obliging of the boy to step out of his official capacity and treat as a friend a man whom he had never seen before, but how about the intended recipient of the telegram? Now that is what you will find everywhere with the Irish, the clerks in the stores, the stationmasters, the policemen, officials high and low. Every transaction with these people is a personal transaction, a man to man affair with no "damned red tape" or artificial nonsense about it. When you are seeking favors or when the general holiday mood is on you and all you ask is friendly intercourse and informality this is delightful, but if you want to get things done or if you crave an impersonal treatment of the situation the Irish attitude is, to say the least, embarrassing. One can only guess at a partial explanation. Perhaps the Irishman's sense of humor is so strong that to think of himself as in an official capacity of any kind seems absurd. Why *he* is *himself* and you are you: the rest is masquerade. Let us agree to wink away the masquerade.

3. And this perhaps is the place to say just a word

about the Irish sense of humor. It is generally misrepresented. The hilarious exuberance of "the broth of a boy" and that misbegotten offspring of supposed stupidity, the "bull," are both of them travesties of the real thing. Irish humor is more subtle. It partakes of the comic. It springs partly from a feeling for proportion, partly from a quickness of imagination that enables the mind to disengage itself from any situation and see it from outside. (That is why the Irish are traditionally cheerful in misfortune: they never get immersed in their troubles.) Its victims are pompousness, over-seriousness, artifice, false or ridiculous pretension. Its methods are sly digs, covert winks, pulling of legs when legs need to be pulled. I once listened to an animated political discussion between two naval officers, shipmates, one Irish, the other English. The latter was much concerned about the Empire and the threat of Irish Home Rule. He was taking himself very seriously. At times he sounded just like an editorial in *The Morning Post*. This was at tea time too! The Irishman had his political convictions of course, but the intensity and fervor of the other was too much for him. It was like a contest between quicksilver and granite, summer lightning making fun of thunder's portentous rumblings.

4. I have already, in passing, said something about the common opinion that the Irish are lazy and happy-go-lucky, but there is a contrast between American and Irish ways of life implied here that deserves some attention. The thing that strikes an Irishman coming to this country is that the whole tempo and stress of life is

different. He notices it at first perhaps in Nature. The summers are intensely hot and the winters bitterly cold. Thunderstorms are of tropical violence. Distances are immense. What he calls a mountain the American will hardly dignify with the name of hill. There are monstrous and unbelievable things like the Grand Canyon. Spring does not approach like a shy maiden, but bursts on one with the effect of an explosion. Man's ways reflect those of Nature. The American doesn't do things, he goes in for things, and goes in hard until he has exhausted them and himself: cross-word puzzles, baseball, football, railroad stations, hotels, business, money, automobiles, radio, national conventions, Prohibition, advertising, divorce and six-day bicycle races. There are no half-tones, no compromises, no regard for the small scale. All is exaggeration and briskness and strenuosity. The Irishman is used to long twilights and a climate where the seasons are barely distinguishable one from another, to small, intimate, and friendly landscapes, to small villages or towns, to modest amusements and games played for the fun of the thing, to leisure and much talk and a simple way of life. He is also, one must admit, used to poverty and dirt and sloppiness and drift and to a rural life or a small town life whose dreariness and barrenness are beyond the scope of American experience or even imagination. In process of adjustment over here he learns some valuable things. He is "generally smartened up," he works harder, lives more responsibly, dresses better, gains in assurance, and learns to deplore that unhappy combination of national pride with ignorance of what is being done in the world outside of which he was probably

the victim in his own country. Yet the danger in this change is that he may become hard and bright and external and committed to a vulgar doctrine of success. That, I think, is what the Irish dread about America. America sometimes seems to them all outside, "all formidable foreground," with nothing within or behind. Observe the returned Irish-American in his native village. Notice how obtrusive and alien seem his city clothes, his harsh speech, his aggressive confidence, the marks of prosperity and success writ large upon him. Something precious has disappeared, some gentleness of manner, some childlike simplicity, some decent humility, some hold, I would almost say, on the realities of spirit and imagination. One wonders whether smartness and all the rest may not have been bought too dearly.

Well, one may wonder; but for many years the Irish will continue to come to America. We cannot help that. But to those who are confronted with the task of making good American citizens out of the Irish who come to these shores I would venture to offer one piece of advice: Be on the lookout all the time not for what you have to teach them but for what they have to teach you. Perhaps that policy is most likely to lead to "combining the best features of both."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Francis Hackett, Ireland

George Bernard Shaw, *John Bull's Other Island*

Edith Somerville and Martin Ross, *The Adventures of an Irish R. M.*

Sean O'Casey, *Juno and the Paycock*, *The Shadow of a Gunman* (Two plays)

CHAPTER VIII

THE ITALIANS

By BRUNO ROSELLI,

Chairman, Department of Italian, Vassar College; lecturer, essayist.

— THE background of an Italian immigrant is something at the same time very glorious and very awkward. As the armor of the Roman infantryman was on the one hand his pride and his protection, yet on the other hand it unquestionably delayed his advance, so the immigrant from sunny Italy whom economic necessity urges upon these shores finds that American enthusiasm over Dante and Julius Caesar, Columbus and Garibaldi, Galileo and Cincinnatus and Mazzini and Raphael and Verdi is more of a hindrance than a help. His proud brow must needs be bowing all the time in a none too pleasant request for foreign compensation for the manual labor he offers—and not only to the United States, but to Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Algeria, France, Canada, Belgium: in short, to all lands where *ten million* Italians live under a foreign flag. Yet the opulence of his background of art, music, literature, law, civil institutions, etc., furnishes such contrast with the manner of living of that real or presumptive scion of Roman lawgivers and empire builders, and of Renaissance humanists and courtiers, that if he lands among

people who are not mentally equipped to appreciate the value of his possibilities as compared with the sad status in which wars, poverty of soil, overpopulation, foreign conquests, and misgovernment in his native Italy had reduced him when he decided to migrate, he is likely to live morosely among his own people, in a world of dreams and of silent brooding, instead of taking an active part in the life of his new community.

Thus it appears that if the so-called "problem" of the Italian immigrant in America is to be solved by education,—a remark trite and platitudinous enough—this education must be *mutual*. The offer of a job in exchange for "Americanization" in the common acceptance of the term, has been tried and found woefully unsatisfactory in dealing with a population blessed and cursed by such background as the Italians possess. The "problem," to be adequately and permanently solved, requires on the part of Americans their willingness to be educated to understand the stupendous human value of Italy's contribution to civilization, just as much as the Italians here must be educated to look above and beyond the America of petty politicians and of hysterical newspaper writers. This article has been written at a time in the history of America when this land, suddenly become aware of the lack of mutual understanding, has endeavored to solve the problem by what amounts in practice to a stoppage of Italian immigration. That solution is legally correct and morally defensible, but it fails to take into account the three million Italians already here and hitherto merely isolated, who, finding themselves cornered, have developed a "heart's

allegiance" for the land of their birth totally undreamed of when the present writer first visited these shores; while their most speedy absorption into the body politic of America has resulted in an "Italian vote" soon to be reckoned with. Confronted by the effects of the boomerang which the suddenness and the rudeness of the Johnson Law created, America may well consider tomorrow the advisability of an alternative remedy: the study and sympathetic understanding of the background of her Italian immigrants.

The field is absorbing, but colossal in its very catholicity. Thus nothing could be more presumptuous than an attempt to force into this brief article a résumé of the Italian immigrant's background in such subjects as music and art, to mention only two of its formative elements. Yet the present writer has no desire to stress the historical fact that the musical notations were invented by Guido of Arezzo, nor does he wish to remind the reader that his or her conception of Christ, the angels, the Madonna, etc., is quite sure to be far more Italian than Palestinian, being subconsciously guided by the astounding artistic production of the Italian Renaissance. No: the art and music of Italy are not mentioned here that they might obtain the unnecessary tribute of more incense and myrrh, but in order to show that they do not appear as delicate luxuries to the poorest Italian immigrant; they are the daily food which his European experience rendered imperative. To a certain extent they made him; but to a similar extent *he* made *them*. Thus the Italian immigrant, when he has acquired a slight financial competence, invests in a piano the

savings which his fellow-immigrant invests in an automobile, and sees to it that his daughter learns how to play it—while her little non-Italian friends, if at all anxious to produce music, approach it by the utterly vicarious method of the talking machine. Likewise the Italo-American has also indefatigably pioneered in the movement for the erection of statues in the public squares of even the most inartistic and utilitarian of American communities, where public sculpture had begun and ended with an unspeakable Civil War monument. It was the Italians who brought back on these shores the brick and stone dwelling which all over New England is rapidly taking the place of the wooden structure so dear to people living in a state of constant flux and limited in their vision of history; the wooden structure which never can be quite superseded by the steel skyscraper. It is they who are supplying the ever-growing American demand for imported laces and embroideries and majolicas; who lead as landscape gardeners, as cutters in the most elegant tailoring establishments, as antiquarians, as theatrical costumers, as operatic stars. They crowd America's museums on Sunday, poring over the masterpieces of their ancestors, instead of wasting their time in the movie houses; or if they are to appear in these at all, they prefer it to be not *before* but *on* the screen, like Rodolfo Valentino. For the Italian longs to show himself more in the rôle of *actor*, real or potential, than in that of *passive* admirer in anything pertaining to the great basic soul-lifting influences, music and art. His "background" along those lines of

pursuit may include Michelangelo and Verdi, Raphael and Rossini, Botticelli and Palestrina, Leonardo and Donizetti, Titian and Mascagni and Veronese and Puccini and Giotto and Donatello and Stradivari and Caruso, but his attitude of friendly and creative familiarity in such fields is one which makes one wonder whether we had not better take cognizance, in this case, of an immigrant "foreground" as well as of a "background."

Next to these, and connected by obvious spiritual ties, comes literature. Here also the Italian's background is immense, although the average American does not appreciate the fact, since literature differs from art and music primarily in that its media are not universal and direct, but subject to a conventional method of expression and capable of reaching only a mind especially trained to use the vessel which conveys the literary cargo—namely, language. Leaving out of the picture, therefore, the literary production of Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Ariosto, Tasso, and a number of other geniuses of the first magnitude, let us proceed from the contained to the container, and see what the Italian immigrant possesses as background from the standpoint of language.

The written language of all Italians is, of course, one. But the dialects are so many, and their differences so very marked, that a Genoese and a Sicilian immigrant do not understand each other at all unless they use the Italian language as a means of verbal exchange: and many of them cannot do it well. Here again we are facing a decided difference between the Italians

living in Italy (whom military service and the restlessness of post-bellum life have finally amalgamated) and those of America, who are still subject to deep lines of regional cleavage, especially between the Northern and the Southern group. Their divergence is so great—divergence not only of speech, but of viewpoint, of training, and in short of everything pertaining to mores,—that I am compelled to give an idea of their different European habitats and of how, when, and why each group came here.

In the year 1861 what the astute Metternich had called "a geographical expression," Italy, became unified under the House of Savoy; for the first time in 1400 years all Italians with trifling exceptions acknowledged the same flag, the same government, the same sovereign. But wars and revolutions cost money; and when in 1870 the taking of Rome gave to that liberated Italy her logical capital, the new-born country took stock of the cost and found that the bloody events of 1848, 1849, 1859, 1860, 1866 had strained the financial structure of the country near the breaking point. We know what happens in such cases: taxes rise to appalling figures. The higher classes disgorged grudgingly; the lower classes looked around in distress for "sanctuaries" wherein to escape the ubiquitous tax collector. And since Italy has no colonies and no raw materials (and therefore neither intensive industrialization nor intra-national migration offered a way out) the poor people of the most congested sections of Italy began to submit, somewhat paradoxically, to denationalization and expatriation, as the price to pay for the

making of their country. Let the reader give the term "poor people" an elastic meaning, for it signifies two different things in Genoa and in Naples. It is only used here in order to insist on the point that the Italian immigration was prompted by purely economic causes; therefore the social worker and legislator may well avoid the customary bombastic remarks about "king-ridden peoples seeking freedom."

The two main streams of this Italian emigration directed themselves toward South America and the United States respectively. The former came from the North-Western section of the country (more exactly from Liguria—not so much from Genoa, its capital, as from the overcrowded Italian Riviera between San Remo and Spezia); the latter from the South-Western (hinterland of Naples, Calabria, Basilicata, Sicily). A deep-rooted antipathy existed then between those two groups of Italians: even now, their children born abroad seldom intermarry.

The North Italian stream left Italy earlier than the South Italian. It had a background of stability which the Southerner was prone to ridicule, as he was unable to imitate it. It made South America its goal, each individual usually carrying a few thousand lire borrowed somewhere, with which to start in business. The work of the "Genoese" immigrant in Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and Brazil corresponds to the combined work of the Irish and Germans here. Those Ligurians opened the first large stores, ran the local governments, and looked down on later immigrants, siding with the outnumbered earlier element against the "scum of the earth" which came later to "lower the patriotic stand-

ard of living." Many a "Genoese" settled in South America in the fifties and sixties; whereas the South Italian element began its real exodus only in the seventies and eighties. Factories and railroads attracted it to the United States. It came here when the great trans-continental railroads were fast developing—and contributed powerfully to the linking of the Atlantic with the Pacific through the arid wilderness, and of the Lakes with the Gulf of Mexico across dismal swamps, in a strange country, alone with cruel yet resourceful *padroni* and with dreams of a little pink home in the East; here, when the children of the Irish and the Germans had refused to toil any longer for little money in the New England factories, and, conscious of their equal rights under American conditions, challenged their employers of Puritan ancestry, compelling them to send all over Italy a number of immigration agents in search of cheaper labor.

When the South Italian element had begun to settle down (at first in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and New Orleans), bringing wives and family heirlooms and entrenching in a so-called "Little Italy" within each of those cities, the North Italian element, which could not be fully absorbed by South America owing to the less advanced industrial state of that region, also sent groups to the United States, but it invariably shunned the "Southerners," and formed its greatest stronghold in the Far West, especially in California, where the "Genoese" have acquired an enviable position, both economically and socially. There the Italian pioneered, instead of underselling somebody; and there everybody was a recent arrival, whether from Boston

or from Genoa, and no *Mayflower* descendant could look down on a descendant of Romulus because of his "lacking in caste and in the mellowing influence of age-long traditions."

But if our North and South Italians differ so much on many counts, their one point of common contact with their trans-Atlantic background is religion. The Italian is a Catholic—historically and psychologically as well as devotionally. Italy has an infinitesimal quantity of Jews and Protestants. The former never emigrate, as they are treated better in Italy than anywhere else on the globe. The emigration of the latter is confined to a group of Waldensians (mainly employed by New York restaurants, or living in a prosperous community at Valdese, N. C.), and to scattered groups of Sicilian Baptists, converted by the many Baptist missions on that island. Of course, living in a Protestant country dotted with proselyting agencies, many Italians in America become converted to Protestantism. This, however, has no bearing upon the subject of immigrant backgrounds, being merely a cis-Atlantic phenomenon.

Of great importance from that angle is, on the contrary, the attitude of the Italian-American toward his church—an attitude often puzzling to outsiders, accustomed to study the Catholicism of our Irish and French-Canadians. The Italian adores the religion of his Fathers, but knows very well the deep line of demarcation between spiritual and temporal and does not, therefore, listen to his priest in matters not affecting his conscience. That often antagonizes American prelates accustomed to greater meekness on the part of their flock. Add to that the supposed mistreatment of

His Holiness by the Italian Government, and you will see why the Italian is often mistrusted by American Catholics as a lukewarm Romanist, while the Protestants try to keep him away as a potential danger to the "freedom of American religion." His position is not enviable.

It seems logical to turn from religion to morals. Theoretically, such a study should be superfluous, as religion includes morals. Since the Italians are Catholic, and since Catholic ethics are well defined, the morals of the Italian-American ought to be those laid down for all good Catholics. In practice, we could not judge by such standards any group of humans: a sad reminder of the failure of religions to perform their chief function! And we all know that just as each group of humans possesses a mass of unwritten laws side by side with the codified laws, and often in conflict with those; and just as this conflict, whenever existing, is sure to be solved in favor of the unwritten law (e.g., dueling in certain European countries, lynching of negro attackers of white women in certain American states, and drinking of alcoholic beverages in most of them), so does the moral code of each people extend beyond that part of the religious code which deals not with the methods of worship but with the ethical tenets of such religion, and so does a part of such moral code conflict with the acknowledged religion of that people, and usually triumph over it. Thus although Christianity may order one to offer his right cheek to the slapper of his left, how many Christians will obey? Certainly not the Italians. The Italian immigrant (particularly the one from the former Kingdom of

the Two Sicilies, has a strong urge to indulge in personal vengeance upon his enemy, (especially if such enemy infringed in any way upon his honor.) Long centuries of slow or non-existent governmental justice, especially under Spanish colonial rule, have aided his natural inclination to take matters into his own hand. Hence the Italians' rather high percentage of crimes affecting human life, (crimes unfortunately seldom punished through lack of testimony, since the unwritten law of *omertà* (literally "manliness") requires that no sympathetic witnesses should testify against the offender.) Happily, this dark picture is offset by the Italians' very low percentage of crimes against property. It should be noted that residence in a country where wealth opens almost every door, and where the wages of death is death, tends to modify somewhat such statistics in opposing directions.

But if, on the one hand, religion impinges on the realm of morals, on the other hand it encroaches upon the field of superstition. While this is not the place to discuss their interrelation, it would be unfair to underestimate the hardships of the educated Catholic priest who has to keep the entire area of his faith unpolluted by the superstitious beliefs that his Italian flock tries to force upon it. Nor does this happen only in the over-imaginative South. Thus during the great civic festivity of the Palio at Siena, in my own Tuscany, each quarter of the city brings to its parish church the horse which will represent it in the historical race, to be blessed on the altar steps. Surely this custom is more sacrilegious than religious; yet if the priest opposes it, he will lose most of his flock; while by sub-

mitting to the custom he subjects Catholicism in general to most uncomplimentary remarks on the part of religiously hostile observers. It is easy to accuse certain creeds of fostering superstition; it were far more profitable to study the extent to which such creeds have had to cover with their blessing a mass of unconquerable superstitions ingrained in their flocks, or fail in their mission.

The Italian's religious superstitions are, of course, endless. The present writer does not wish to mention under this heading the all-pervading importance which the Madonna—technically only the intermediary between man and God—has acquired for the Italians. The sweet and godly handmaid of the Lord to whom the great Carducci gave the imperishable title of "new and holy Venus of Italy" has risen in their eyes to a primary importance obviously beyond her rôle as an intercessor, mainly because the Italian nature basks in a vision of blessed and unblemished femininity. So far, so good. But how about the Saints, whom the Church desires to see honored but not actually worshipped? Are we truly to believe, as we see the simple-minded Italian peasant paying Godly homage to them, that he is merely interested in seeing how he can best emulate their virtues, and rise to their heights? Why not admit the presence of hero worship, and trust that those who rule the destinies of the Church, if they had their own way, would gladly transfer to other religious objects the frenzy which occupies the heart of every true Neapolitan when he sees the blood of Saint Januarius boil yearly in its glass receptacle on the day sacred to

that saint? Thus it is confidently believed by most Italians in America that Saint Roch protects from epidemics, Saint Lucy from eye diseases, Saint Joseph grants a "good death," Saint Pasquale secures satisfactory husbands, Saint Biagio cures diphtheria and all sorts of throat infections.

But when we leave the field of more or less superstitious distortions of religious tenets and enter the realm of supernatural beliefs in a spiritual world in which religion is not even ever claimed to have a part, we pass from something applying to the almost totality of Italians here to a maze of notions so different from group to group as to prevent a classification: yet your ignorance thereof may be resented by them. Thus, for instance, in some parts of Italy you must not praise the beauty of a little child without adding "May God save him." Other superstitions, on the contrary, the Italians share with other peoples. The dire results of spilling salt, breaking a mirror, hearing the owl screech, starting your journey on a Tuesday, marrying on a Friday, doing pretty nearly anything on the 13th, meeting a hunchback woman in the street—are known in many lands. But among the superstitions which affect more specifically the Italians, only the Italians, most of the Italians, and especially the type of Italians who come to America—are the beliefs in the evil eye (*maldocchio*) and in the *jettatura*. The former is an evil spell which can be cast by almost anyone, or even anything, for causes oftentimes futile, and certainly too varied to be mentioned here. The latter is something far more serious, as Pirandello's terrible dramatization of its dire results, "La Patente," so

graphically shows. The verb *jettare* means to throw. The *jettatore*—literally thrower—is the person who systematically, even unconsciously, throws a foul spell on anything or anybody he approaches. He is supposed to have certain peculiarities of appearance, dress, etc.—e.g., he wears goggles, walks furtively, and so on. It is incredible what inroads this belief, which originated in the former Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, has made in the minds of even the most reasonable Italians. The Army and the Navy are sadly swayed by it. Even in Rome, the capital, the way to destroy a rising politician is to whisper that he is a *jettatore*, or simply to make certain gestures supposed to offset his spell. A celebrated and recent pope “enjoyed” the reputation of being a *jettatore*. The average army explanation of the Caporetto disaster was that it resulted from a *jettatore* being at the head of the local body of troops; it certainly had the advantages of being simple, and of throwing the responsibility on superhuman influences.

In the course of this discussion, repeated mention has been made of the former Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. A few words on the past political status of our Italian immigrants’ country of origin—which, as I stated before, only became united half a century ago—will aid in the understanding of his background.

The “Kingdom of the Two Sicilies” was one of the seven states into which Italy was divided just before unification. It comprised the entire Southern half of continental Italy, and Sicily—and therefore the lands from which *three quarters* of the Italians in the United States emigrated: Sicily, Calabria, Abruzzi, from

which came so many scattered groups—Basilicata which emptied itself upon these shores leaving only the lame, the halt and the blind—Campania which sent most of the hinterland of Naples. Of the other 25 per cent, 15 per cent migrated from the former “Kingdom of Sardinia,” which comprised North-western Italy and Sardinia: these came mostly from the fringe of small Ligurian towns East and West of Genoa. Another 5 per cent came from the old Grand-Duchy of Tuscany, and specifically from the over-populated district around Lucca. There were four more states in pre-unification Italy: Lombardy-Venice, under Austria; the duchies of Parma and Modena; and the Papal States. But they all sent few emigrants here. Noteworthy among these—qualitatively at least—are only the group of marble workers of Carrara (in the former Duchy of Modena), which scattered through the outskirts of American cemeteries carving sepulchral monuments, and formed one compact group of granite quarrymen at Barre, Vermont; and the survivors of the abortive “Sunnyside Colony” attempted by Austin Corbin on the banks of the Mississippi, which was to have perpetuated itself through fixed yearly quotas of immigrants from the Roman Campagna.

When all those states were unified, the Italian political system suffered a shock of great magnitude. If cruelty and graft had characterized the earlier régime, the new one brought centralization and bureaucracy. The Italian immigrant of those early days, or even of the period immediately preceding the War, has sad memories of his dealings with those who governed

Italy. His intense love for her has been truly one-sided. That 170,000 Italians should have left America to fight in the War under the flag of a country of which they had seen only the worst traits, is amazing and tremendous. Needless to say, hardly any of those early emigrants had ever voted in Italy, since they did not possess the economic qualifications which would admit them to the voters' lists. Also, they usually came from villages where the political issues were befogged by local squabbles. Italy never had elections both intelligent and honest.

And if the political system of Italy left so much to be desired when the great exodus toward these shores began, the economic system was even worse. Here Italy was, and is, notoriously facing an *impasse*. Arrived late in the race for colonies and raw materials, in a world in which the latter become more and more essential and the former hasten to vie with their motherlands in prosperity, she is also compelled to deplete her treasury owing to high military and naval expenses necessitated by her central position on the path of all troubles—being contiguous to so many belligerent peoples, and, above all, handicapped by a long coast line so hard to defend. Industrialization began soon after unification; but with raw materials to be imported from competing countries, Italy's industrial position remained precarious: it could maintain itself only on a basis of very low reward for labor. That meant a correspondingly low standard of living; it played wonderfully into the hands of Italy's competitors, and enabled them to close the immigration gate, they being satisfied that the Italians were "inferior"—but failing to

notice that their own cornering of this world's bounties had made the Italians so! As to agriculture, always the cornerstone of Italy's economic system, it was improved somewhat under the new régime; but there is a fixed "state of saturation" in the population of even the best developed agricultural area, and Italy is reaching it in an alarmingly increasing number of places.

Next to the economic, the educational system. Unified Italy was confronted by an appalling situation. It was bad enough in the North; but in the South everything had to be done. Illiteracy was the rule, and the local authorities of each village were none too eager to change a state of affairs which made their superiority obvious and their methods of exploitation secure. Carefully, gradually, Italy built new schoolhouses, trained teachers, freed education from abuses which weighed it down. But to establish an endless chain of schools in an agricultural country of scattered farmhouses was economically prohibitive. The new Italy surmounted the difficulty by having the three "R's" taught in the barracks, where every able-bodied Italian male used to spend the best part of thirty-two months. That explains why so many of the Italians who came to America before the age of nineteen are illiterate; also, why the percentage of illiteracy is so great among Italian women.

Needless to say, Italy has no apologies to offer for higher education; the country which opened at Bologna the earliest university in the world, and which shed such educational light from Padua—Portia's Padua—Pavia, Salerno, etc., has lately added three to her many ancient and glorious universities. But higher

education had little to do with the background of the humble Italian immigrant. In fact, one of his most lamentable traits is that while he prizes the education which his boy or girl receives in the public schools of America, he very seldom entertains higher educational ambitions for them, even when he could well afford the cost. He has not yet learned the lesson which the American Jew could teach him so well; that in America the child of uneducated parents has not only the right but the duty to rise to the highest rungs of the educational ladder, and thus achieve the success which his uneducated father failed to obtain.

Whenever the present writer has reprimanded an Italian for his mistake, he has been confronted with the same answer, which throws so much light upon the life of Italians: "If our child keeps on studying, it will break up the family." That there is some truth in the matter can hardly be doubted. Given the conditions of modern America, too great a divergence of intellectual pursuits between people living constantly under the same roof becomes awkward and often ends by making co-habitation unfeasible. But the serene way in which the loving parents never saw that a possible severance of bodily connections might be the price to pay in order that their children might succeed, showed the amazing power which the only *real* unit among Italians,^s *the family*,¹ still wields.) Governments come and go, success comes and goes, allurements (for the husband only!) in the form of infidelities may come and go: the family proceeds intact. Thus there may be every valid reason why one of the sons (or daughters), who

works far from home, should dwell elsewhere; until he is married and another *family* is formed, he cannot go; and many an Italian-American father will re-assert his "*patria potestas*" in the face of an American official who sides with the more Americanized younger member of the family. This is basic in his background. In certain rural districts in Italy the younger son of a farmer has no right to marry until his older brother has married; and a family council passes on the desirability of the bride. There, in all cases, of course, the old-world system of the dowry prevails, even if it only means the girl bringing one object, the nuptial bed—in honor of the principle that the bride must contribute something to her new household.

Women in Italy are, of course, granted a certain amount of freedom since the War; but this could not affect the Italian-American family. Furthermore, the Italian South is truly oriental in that respect. The wife stays at home, and the only time an outsider sees her is when he is invited to dinner as a guest of her husband. Then she proudly cooks and occasionally helps to serve the meal. Strangely enough, she seldom sits down to dinner herself on such an occasion, especially if there are several men guests. The daughters, if there be any, may appear, but must remain inconspicuous. Their opportunity is likely to come later, when they proceed to the piano and play, or sing some Neapolitan song. The Oriental woman must be a dreamy unreality: her musical voice should be heard mainly when it sings.

Whether married or unmarried, the South Italian woman of America enjoys very little freedom. At the

door of our large department stores, when the sales-people are about to leave, one can see many an Italian father or brother waiting for his daughter or sister to appear and be escorted home. He does not trust her out alone. Thus do American conditions fail to affect basically the life of the South Italian woman. Supervision may be a little less strict in the "Genoese" group; but, by and large, the Italian strata from which most Italian immigrants came, used to keep their women-folk straight by the good old method of taking no chances.

Needless to say, divorce, which is very rare among Italians in America, does not exist in Italy; just as the background of the American Italian shows nothing concerning those quasi-matrimonial situations so common in certain Nordic countries, and actually amounting in some of them to a kind of trial marriage. The Italian woman is supposed to reach matrimony without any previous sexual, and with very little emotional, experience. Once married, she is expected to be the undisputed queen of her household, but to have very few interests outside. Club life, kitchenette house-keeping, movie attendance for recreational purposes, as understood by the average American housewife, neither interest her nor present a practical possibility. And since most of the Italians among us come from places where the climate is hot and food spoils easily, so they suspect any canned goods; and the women-folk must serve nothing but fresh food for every meal. They, however, love to do it, as the chief joys of the Italian woman consist in giving her man some food every day and a child every year.

It might seem as if the difference in occupations, in mental level, and in daily associations of the Italo-American man and woman might make for unhappiness. In reality it does not; for happiness depends (not on being granted vague and ever-increasing privileges which you do not want but think you ought to have in order not to be left behind; it depends) on knowing exactly what you want—no matter how little—and in getting it all. The Italian-American man, true to his trans-Atlantic background, wants to be made happy, respected, and envied through the mother of his very obedient and educationally none too ambitious children. And the Italian-American woman, also true to her distant background, wants many children, a home, a man who will stand between her meek little self and the big world outside; (who will scold her often, beat her seldom, betray her as little as possible, be happy over her portentous economies, own their house down to the last brick, take her out to mass on Sunday, and gaze with pride at the cheap and gay “American” clothes which she wears so badly—mainly because they represent the only part of her which is untrue to her background. Oh, for the lovely native costumes of the women of Sicily, the Abruzzi, Calabria! So historical, so picturesque, so well differentiated from town to town.

Whether here or in Italy, the apparent drabness of the Italian's life is relieved by festas and other unusual events; for the life of an Italian is never an even succession of semi-automatic pursuits, regulated by custom, timepieces, and the line of least resistance. Thus, for instance, the Italian will live on almost nothing

for ten days, and then enjoy a Gargantuan feast on the eleventh in honor of Saint Rosalia or of Mussolini's March on Rome. The menus of these Italian-American feasts are appalling—but also illuminating in showing how faithfully the diners adhere to their background. Italian custom requiring one set of dishes, culinary loyalty to America another, grapefruit is followed by *antipasto*, clam chowder by spaghetti, and so on. These are the occasions when the Italo-Americans do not mind departing from their Italian sense of economy. While they contribute almost nothing to charity (having vainly tried for twenty years to run creditably a little hospital in New York, a city with 800,000 Italians), they will spend one thousand dollars for a banquet at some big suburban casino. Yet this is, strangely enough, a logical consequence of their background. Individualistic by instinct, and successful only through individual effort and despite the snares of all organizations (immigration bureaus, tax-collecting agencies, etc.), they do not understand yet the value of coöperation; whereas it is natural that the Jews, who for centuries have protected themselves and their precarious holdings by mutual defense and a closely knit racial organization, should realize more than any other racial group the invaluable boon of coöperation.

Needless to say, in those large affairs the women-folk do not appear. They are alone at home a great deal, usually with their young children, with whom they seem to spend every minute of their lives,—sometimes with dire results! They are so eager to see them walking at an early age that they often make them bow-legged; so eager to feed them that they give them indigestion;

so eager to appease them when they cry that they encourage them to cry all the time; so eager to play with them that they put shiny objects too near their eyes and thus make them cross-eyed. When the lamentable results are realized, some saint is appealed to, more likely than some doctor. Happily, the old witchcraft methods, which did form a part of the Italian immigrant's background, have lately been almost entirely abandoned. The saint chosen for the medical appeal is either the child's namesake, or the "special protector" for the disease or handicap in question, or the one whose *festa* is taking or about to take place.

The background of the Italian immigrant calls for innumerable festas, religious and otherwise. Contemporary Italy has reduced them officially to two; but this Mussolinian reform does not affect the Italian-American for whom the Conception and the Assumption of Mary, the Epiphany, the days dedicated to Saints Joseph and John, and possibly Peter, and certainly Januarius if he is a Neapolitan and Saint Rosalia if he is a Sicilian, vie in popularity with Columbus Day, Good Friday, May Day, the Pentecost, Palm Sunday, All Saints Day, Memorial Day, the anniversary of the taking of Rome by Victor Emmanuel II in 1870, and now even that of the re-taking of it by the Black Shirts in 1922. On such generous background America superimposes her own holidays!

On all such days, Old-World games of all kinds are likely to take place. Of dances there are not so many; the un-Americanized Italian, being more elemental and reasoning than stereotyped, sees (as does the Arab the Hindoo, and the Amer-

ican Indian) gross immorality in the bodily contacts of modern dancing: an immorality which is to him fundamentally unaffected by the fact that society sanctions it. But the men often dance together, holding each other tight and whirling about, as sailors do. Regrettable indeed is the almost total absence from Italian nuclei in America of the beautiful *tarantella*, which the cis-Atlantic Neapolitan finds apparently too inconsistent with his Americanization. Card games are, of course, popular; *briscola*, *tresette*, etc., being among the favorite games. Certain sections of Italy use a special type of cards, but none of them have ever been seen in America by the present writer. Dice appear often; and one should not forget the ever-popular *mora*, the poor man's game requiring no paraphernalia and played by your showing to another person a certain number of your fingers, while he does the same, and calling aloud what you believe to be the total of fingers shown by all four hands. *Lotto*—the curse of Naples, as shown by Serao's literary masterpiece, "Il Paese di Cuccagna"—is strongly etched upon the American-Italian's background; but its illegality here, and the difficulty of controlling the practices of its contraband substitutes, have banished it from America.

Much has been written, and more could profitably be, upon the social usages of old Italy, which were imported into America by the Italians. But they seldom thrive on immigrant soil, killed by ridicule whenever customs sharply differ, and each immigrant strain is slight, and the land of ultimate settlement is no distant colony but a well-organized provider of industrial

employment. Thus for instance, the old Italian habit of men kissing each other on both cheeks when they meet after a prolonged absence is soon abandoned owing to the mirth provoked in an American railway station; and the "bis! bis!" (encore, encore!) of unadulterated Roman form in Italian opera houses is vainly attempted here and never countenanced by American audiences. The Italian may still be permitted to roll his spaghetti on a fork if he so desires, but at the cost of a smile of indulgence on the part of his American witnesses. And he is surely no longer allowed the time-honored Italian custom of drinking the health of his hosts in the familiar liquid of joyful conviviality.

True, the Italian element in America is perhaps prone to treat contemptuously, in theory if not in practice, the Eighteenth Amendment, and the majority of cases in which Italian-Americans are brought to Court may be entered directly or indirectly under the heading of violations of the Prohibition Law. The present writer, who against the general custom became a total abstainer long before taking up his residence in America, does not wish to offer any extenuating circumstances, and, in fact, finds it decidedly illogical for Italians to make such heroic effort to square up their behaviour with the idea of citizenship taught them by the land of their new destiny, and then mar their records by being unable to control their longing for a special kind of beverage in which they never were wont to indulge to excess. But there is a different and larger aspect of that situation which I humbly recommend to American public opinion, especially where legislators

are concerned. The century-old mores of a large section of the population of a country cannot be lightly overlooked by reformers. Three million Italians in this country belonging to a racial group accustomed since time immemorial to the consumption of some commodity, should not have been ignored by the sponsors of so drastic an experiment, honestly designed to meet the scandalous craving for strong liquors on the part of early American elements. When we consider how carefully the matter of sacramental beverage for the Jews was weighed by the drafters of this act, we obtain one more proof, not, as the Italians claim, of pro-Jewish and anti-Italian discrimination, but of a peculiar inclination on the part of the early American element to take into account and to treat with the utmost consideration any *religious* peculiarity of all denizens of America, but to make light of the mores of large sections of its immigrants on the historically fallacious pretext that their "Americanization" should change habits and traditions as rapidly as a new oath of allegiance changes their citizenship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arias, Gino, *La questione meridionale*, Bologna, Zanichelli, 1921
- Bosi, Alfredo, *Cinquant' anni di vita italiana in America*, New York, Bagnasco Press, 1921
- Brenna, Paulo G., *L'emigrazione italiana nel periodo ante-bellico*, Firenze, Bemporad, 1918
- Carr, John Foster, *The coming of the Italian*, New York, Liberal Immigration League, 1906

- Casamorata, Cesare, In California. (In the magazine *Universo*, Firenze, 1920.)
- Clark, Francis Edward, Our Italian fellow-citizens in their old homes and their new, Boston, Small, Maynard & Co., 1919
- Colajanni, Napoleone, La criminalita' degli italiani negli Stati Uniti. (In the magazine *Nuova Antologia*, Roma, 1910.)
- Sulle condizioni che favoriscono la criminalita' degli italiani negli Stati Uniti d'America. (In the magazine *Rassegna Contemporanea*, Roma, 1910.)
- Coletti, Francesco, Dell' emigrazione italiana, Milano, U. Hoepli, 1912
- Falorsi, Vittorio, Problemi di emigrazione: Dal primo congresso degli italiani all' estero all legge Johnson, Bologna Zanichelli, 1924
- Foerster, Robert Franz, The Italian Emigration of Our Times, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1919
- Lord, Eliot, The Italian in America, New York, B. F. Buck & Co., 1905
- Mariano, John Horace, The second generation of Italians in New York City. (Published also under the title "The Italian Contribution to American Democracy.") Boston, Christopher Publishing Co., 1921
- Pecorini, Alberto, The Italians in the United States. (In the magazine *Forum*, New York, 1911.)
- Roselli, Bruno, An Arkansas Epic. (In the magazine *Century*, New York, 1920.)
- Rossi, Adolfo, Vita d'America, Roma, Perino, 1891
- Russo, Giacomo (Baron), L'émigration et ses effets dans le midi de l'Italie, Paris, M. Rivière, 1912
- Stella, Antonio, Some aspects of Italian Immigration to the United States, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924
- Villari, Luigi, li Stati Uniti d'Americae l'emigrazione italiana, Milano, Fratelli Treves, 1912

CHAPTER IX

THE JEWS

By S. DINGOL,

Managing Editor, "The Day," New York.

IT was Haman, the first known anti-Semite, who said of the Jews: "There is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all the provinces and their laws are diverse from all people. . . ."

This trenchant accusation, hurled against the Jews in Biblical times, and aimed to arouse hatred against them in the realm of King Ahasuerus, incidentally states the problem and difficulty of tracing the background of the Jewish immigrant in America.

Jewish immigration to the United States flows from all parts of the world. Every Jewish immigrant brings along with him not only his racial and religious traits which unite him with all other Jews, but also many of the habits, manners and customs of the people among whom he dwelt, which differentiate him from his kin who lived among other nations. This tends to make of the immigrant Jews not one composite group, but rather a collection of many groups, at once individualistic and universal.

Language, which identifies the members of almost every nationality, cannot serve as a basis for identification among the Jewish immigrant group. Hebrew,—

the national language of the Jew, is, like old Greek, not spoken by any large number of Jews outside of Palestine. The nearest approach to a Jewish language is Yiddish, which is now the mother-tongue of about six million Jews. The German and the French Jews, however, speak the language of their countries as the rest of their fellow-nationals; the Russian and Polish Jews speak mainly Yiddish, and many of them scarcely understand the languages of their respective countries, due to the restrictions which were imposed upon Jews in those countries for a long time, which denied them even elementary education in the public schools. In Rivington Street, on the East Side of New York, a weekly paper is published in Hebrew characters, but no Hebrew outside of a small group of Spanish-Jewish immigrants can read it. Greek Jews would not understand the talk of a Polish Jew, and a Syrian Jew could not make himself understood to the East European Jew except by signs and gestures.

Thus, many a Jewish immigrant, on landing in the United States, has to undergo a double process of assimilation, first to find his place in the Ghetto, and then to make his way in the new world.

Notwithstanding the handicaps of language and difference of customs, the Jewish community of the United States has grown in one century from a paltry 16,000 in 1826, to nearly 4,000,000 in 1927, with almost half of that number in New York City, which is now considered the largest Jewish community in the world.

But to gain an insight into the life and character of the Jewish immigrant of today, one must turn to the

history of Jewish immigration to this country, then trace each group to the country of its origin, and follow up the development of the group as it came and established its home here and created its communal life, which has influenced, to some extent, the life of the subsequent groups, and helped mould certain characteristics which may now be applied to the entire Jewish immigrant community.

The Jews are among the oldest settlers in the United States. It has been stated on good authority that Portuguese Jews participated in the expedition of Christopher Columbus on his first voyage to the new world. It is certain that Spanish and Portuguese Jews were in New Amsterdam as early as September, 1654. At the time of the Revolution there were about two thousand Jews in the colonies, most of them well-to-do merchants of Spanish and Portuguese descent, who had emigrated from Portugal or Holland. They were men of religion and well versed in Jewish law. In religion, they were orthodox, but they confined their Jewishness to their homes and synagogues. In everyday life, they were Americans and many contributed of their money and men to the cause of the Revolution.

The next large body of Jewish immigrants to this country came from Germany in the forties of the last century. The causes of their emigration were economic and political. Germany was in the throes of revolution and reaction and many liberals had to flee the country for fear of persecution. It is estimated that more than 300,000 Jews from Germany arrived in the United States between the years 1836 and 1865.

These immigrants were not wealthy; but they were men of honor and principles, energy and ambition. Together with their non-Jewish countrymen, they settled in the West which was then offering many opportunities to the farmer and to the trader. A number of them took to peddling and penetrated new states and territories; a still larger number settled in the big cities. In 1840, three years after Chicago was incorporated as a town, we find there the first Jewish peddler by the name of Isaac Ziegler, two Jewish tailors and about twenty more Jews, all from Germany.

The German Jews soon outnumbered the Spanish-Portuguese; they amassed wealth and influence in the community. The peddlers and small traders became owners of big stores and large offices, and began to lay the foundation for a Jewish communal life on a big, unprecedented scale.

Fraternal orders, temples and charitable institutions were founded. A sense of responsibility towards the poor and a desire for power and authority in the community was the impetus. In New York, the Jews' Hospital (now the Mount Sinai) was organized in 1857, and the United Hebrew Charities in 1874. In Philadelphia, the Hebrew Education Society was organized in 1848, and the Jewish Hospital Association in 1865. The United Hebrew Relief Association of Chicago was organized in 1859, and the first Jewish Hospital there was built in 1868. The fraternal order "Bnai Brith" (Sons of the Covenant) was founded in 1843. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations was organized in 1871, and it now numbers over two hun-

dred congregations with a membership of 50,000 which includes practically all of the German Jews in America.

The greatest contribution of the German Jews to the Jewish community of the United States is organized charity and team work in communal affairs. They have brought their business sagacity into communal work and social service. They are experts in collecting large sums of money for charitable purposes, and in controlling its distribution. Because they are the wealthiest element of the Jewish community they are also the largest contributors to every worthy philanthropic cause.

The reign of the German element in the Jewish community of America had been supreme for more than half a century until it was challenged by the newest Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, notably by the Russians.

Jewish immigration from Russia dates back to the forties of the last century; at least two synagogues patronized by Russian Jews on the East Side of New York, one on Henry Street and the other on Norfolk Street, were built in that decade. But up to the eighties of the last century, the number of Russian Jews in the United States was very small. Today, Russian Jews form the majority of the Jewish population in the United States, probably over two million.

The first wave of Jewish emigration from Russia came in 1881, following the anti-Jewish riots in Western Russia during which many houses were plundered and burned. This Jewish exodus from Russia subsided for a few years and was resumed with greater force in

1888; it continued with very slight downward changes up to the World War.

It is stated by competent authorities that when the reactionary leader of Russia, the late Pobjedonoszev, was asked as to his solution of the Jewish problem in his country, he said: "A third of the Jews will have to be killed, a third will change their religion and a third will emigrate." It seems that he scored at least on two points. Out of six million Jews in Russia, no less than two million have emigrated to America; the War and the subsequent revolution and pogroms have diminished the Jewish population in Russia more than a third. He was wrong only as to the change of religion. The Jew still clings to the faith of his forefathers, in the new world no less than in the old.

—The Jewish immigrants from Russia brought with them to America an immense reserve of suppressed energy, a longing for freedom, and a desire for learning. For in Russia the Jews were not permitted to take part in the government of the country, nor to hold office, nor to own land, nor to trade in the larger cities outside the pale of settlement, nor even to live in small villages within the pale.

Compelled to become an urban population, business and trade were the chief sources of income of the Jew. The man who earned a living with his brawn instead of his brain was looked upon by the upper and middle classes as a lower grade member of the community. Because of his devotion to religion, the rabbi and the man of Talmudic knowledge and learning were highly respected. Wealthy Jewish merchants would go to

Rabbinical colleges in distant cities, to seek husbands for their marriageable daughters and would provide homes and comforts for their sons-in-law for many years, on condition that they continue to study God's word and His Laws.

Family life was sacred. Children were considered a blessing. Sons would be sent to school and daughters kept at home to help their mothers about the house and prepare for matrimony and motherhood. A childless marriage was ground for divorce.

The sense of morality was high, but it was more of a religious and social character. Business was conducted on a small scale. Partnerships were rare, and still rarer were corporate ownerships, to evolve and develop business standards as they are known in more developed industrial countries.

In America conditions have changed.

The Jewish workingmen were the first immigrants to form Trade Unions and raise their standard of living. As tailoring was easy to learn and most of the clothing manufacturers were Jews, the Russian immigrants flocked to the needle trades. In 1890, the Cloakmakers' Union, with a membership almost entirely composed of Jewish immigrants, carried on a strike for eight weeks, and settled it with a complete triumph for the workers. Many other trades where immigrant workingmen were employed had been organized under a federation, known as the United Hebrew Trades, and some of the larger unions are now affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

The Jewish merchants who were driven from Russia

by the so-called "temporary laws of 1882" which restricted their trade and places of residence in Russia, took here to peddling as a business, and in later years, many of them became rich merchants and storekeepers. Jewish students who were expelled from the Russian universities for their liberal political views found their way to American universities. Those who had no means to study worked their way through college by working during the day and attending classes at night. Some of those students are now numbered among the most prominent lawyers, physicians and workers in many other fields of science.

The economic, political and cultural restrictions against the Jews in Eastern Europe had a strong influence on their character. It often made them distrustful of their neighbors and sensitive to the opinions of the outside world. Every adverse criticism they would interpret as a signpost towards more stringent laws against them. It made them more self-centered and clannish. Not given the opportunity to train their children in secular schools, they sent them to Hebrew religious schools which concentrated on the study of the Talmud and Jewish lore; and there is hardly a male among Russian or Polish Jews who cannot read printed Hebrew.

For a time the East European Jews were looked down upon by the German Jews, as they in turn were looked down upon by the Spanish-Portuguese Jews of a century earlier. But the rapid growth of the East European Jewish communities, the rise of many of its members to wealth and power, the building up of an in-

fluent Yiddish newspaper press which is frank in its criticism of the paternalistic attitude of the German Jews and is strong in its advocacy of a more democratic leadership in the community,—all this has done away with many prejudices against the East European Jew, at least in his own community. Today one can find East European and German Jews, with a sprinkling of descendants of the old Spanish-Portuguese communities, sitting together at a Board of Directors' meeting of some well-known national Jewish institutions and local charities.

To sum up, these three groups of Jewish immigrants—the Spanish-Portuguese with their religiousness, the German Jews with their worldly culture and knack for communal organization, the East European Jews with their suppressed longing for freedom and opportunity—they give us the key to the background of the Jewish immigrant group and reveal to us some of its characteristics.

1. First among them is religious tradition. Each of these three immigrant groups has made its distinct contribution towards Jewish religious form and ritual observance in America. The Synagogue came with the Spanish-Portuguese Jews, the Temple, with the German Jews, and the Jewish Center, which is a combination of the traditional synagogue and the fraternity club, is the creation of the Russian Jews. Even the activities of the Zionists for the rehabilitation of Palestine as a Jewish homeland is with many Jews nothing short of a spiritual revival, a sort of religious feeling instilled by centuries of prayers for the restoration of Zion.

Whether the Jew belongs to a synagogue or repudiates it, his religion and its traditions remain with him. There are thousands of Jews whose religious faith has been so modified by American conditions that it is no longer part and parcel of their daily life, but nevertheless they rush to the synagogues on the high holidays and fill them to capacity; Jewish theatres, moving picture houses and private homes in Jewish localities have to be converted into temporary houses of prayer on such occasions.

2. Racial sympathy, which is sometimes mistaken for Jewish solidarity, is another characteristic of the Jew. When the Jews in Poland or Roumania are oppressed, the Jews respond everywhere. It is because of the fact that for centuries Jewish persecution has been shifted from one country to another, and the experience of the Roumanian or Polish Jew today is the past or future experience of other Jews in other countries.

3. Contrary to popular belief, there are really no discernible physical characteristics by which the Jew can be distinguished from others. In places where Italian and Jewish immigrants work together, it would be hard to tell from appearance who is the Italian and who is the Jew. Some Jewish immigrants who arrive to this country from Germany look more like native Americans than many an American whose ancestors came on the *Mayflower*.

4. The mental complex of the orthodox Jew who for centuries believed himself to be one of the Chosen People is discarded by the Jewish immigrant on arrival in America. That chosen people idea prevailed in some

European ghettos and helped the Jew preserve his identity and self-respect in a world hostile to him. Here, one fears, the Jewish immigrant is leaning towards the other extreme and suffers from a mild inferiority complex.

5. The forces of Americanization work rapidly among Jewish immigrants although as a group they resent every compulsory method of Americanization. The Yiddish press, with a daily circulation of over half a million, devotes more than half of its editorial space to American political, economic and cultural topics, preparing the immigrant for his civic duties when he becomes a citizen, and stimulating at the same time his interest in matters that affect him as a Jew.¹ There are hundreds of evening classes where adult immigrants learn English and many Hebrew and Yiddish schools in the larger cities of the United States, to which immigrant Jewish parents daily send their children after public school instruction is over. The Hebrew schools are mostly of a religious character; the pupils, mainly boys, are instructed in the Bible, Jewish history and ritual. The Yiddish schools are of a more secular nature and the pupils, boys and girls, are taught to read and write Yiddish, to study Jewish history and to familiarize themselves with the writings of Jewish authors.

There are 26 Jewish theatres in the United States, twelve of them in New York City, all producing plays

¹ An analysis of the subject matter treated editorially by the Yiddish press has shown the following results: American problems, 64.4%; Jewish group issues, 25.9%; world issues, 9.7%.—M. Soltes, *The Yiddish Press*.

from Jewish immigrant life here and in the old countries, with occasional translations from American and foreign playwrights.

6. Education and culture is a strong point with the Jewish immigrant. Jewish parents will sacrifice much of their worldly comforts to keep their children in school. Minor children will not be sent to work unless the family is on the verge of starvation. Truancy is rare among Jewish children because the Jewish mother is eager to coöperate with the school authorities to secure the regular attendance of her children.

In the City College of New York, the number of Jewish students is very large and out of all proportion to the Jewish population of the city. The same condition prevails in other cities with a large Jewish population.

7. Sobriety and strong family ties are two more characteristics of the Jewish immigrants.

"The Jewish immigrant has shown to consist essentially of permanent settlers. Its family movement is incomparable in degree and contains a larger proportion, as well as an absolute number of women and children than any other immigrant people," writes a student of Jewish immigration.²

8. Ambition and a desire for independence is also typical of the Jewish group. The Jewish workingman will not be satisfied to remain at the bench all his life. He will work industriously and live thriftily so as to become an employer in his own right. The Jewish

² S. Joseph, *Jewish Immigration to the U. S.*, Columbia University Studies, 1914.

peddler will strive to be the possessor of a modest store and then aim for a bigger one. This, perhaps, is due to the fact that most of the Jewish workingmen are employed in seasonal trades, which keep them busy only between twenty-two to thirty-six weeks in the year, leaving them spare time to look for better opportunities in other trades or occupations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

P. Wiernik, *History of the Jews in America*, 1912

Samuel Joseph, *Jewish Immigration to the United States from 1881-1910*, 1914

N. S. Shaler, *The Neighbor*, 1904 (chapter on the Hebrew Problem)

Jewish Communal Register, New York City

CHAPTER X

JUGO SLAVS AND CZECHOSLOVAKS

By HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER,

*Professor of Sociology, Ohio State University; author of "Races,
Nations and Classes."*

THE name Slav applies to a large group of peoples and is parallel to Teuton and Celt. All who come under the name are popularly supposed to have blood relationship. Properly, however, Slav is used to specify a linguistic group which also has some semblance of cultural and racial unity, although there are wide variations in both factors.

Jugo Slav means South Slav. Recently it has been applied to that group of Slavs who belong to what is officially the "Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes," and which appears in the press dispatches as Jugo Slavia. This is sometimes written as one word, but is really an adjective and a noun.

Geographically, Bulgaria should be included among the South Slavs, but, due to the antagonisms of the War, in which Serbia won allied sympathy and Bulgaria hostility, it was rather widely believed that the Bulgarians were not genuine Slavs. It is true that there is a considerable mixture of other stock in the Bulgarians, but such mixture is common among almost all

peoples. The language and the culture, however, of the Bulgarians is as distinctly Slavic as that of any of the other Slavs. There should also be included in this grouping the less politically differentiated Macedonians, and Montenegrins.

The modern history of the Slavs began with their conversion to Christianity by the two brothers Cyril and Methodius in the middle of the ninth century. Cyril's efforts resulted in the establishment of the Greek Orthodox Church and the Cyrillic alphabet which now prevail in Bulgaria, Serbia, and Russia. Methodius, on the other hand, is responsible for the Roman Catholic Church and the Latin alphabet among the rest of the Slavs. Whatever there was of religion and written language among them were superseded by these forms.

Since the Scriptures and ritual were translated into the language that was first met by Cyril on his journey north from Constantinople, the Old Slavonic which is used in the service of the Greek Orthodox Church, is more nearly like Bulgarian than like Serbian or Russian.

The Slavic languages are highly inflected, and as they are spelled they look strange and unpronounceable to Westerners. The languages which were found by the missionaries had sounds that were different from the Latin and Greek to which the alphabets had been applied. Two devices were adopted to meet the situation. The Cyrillic group, which took as a basis the Greek alphabet, made new characters for the unusual sounds. The other group kept the original Latin letters and secured the same results either by some arbitrary com-

binations of letters, or by the use of marks over letters to modify the pronunciation. Having adopted these schemes the Slavic languages differ from English in being invariably pronounced as they are spelled.

Take for example, the name Czech, whose sound cannot possibly be guessed by one unfamiliar with the use of the letters. It is spelled by the people themselves Čech and is pronounced very nearly like French Tcheque, though the last ch is guttural. In Polish, instead of a mark over the letter, z is used following it. The prevailing spelling of this name might better have been that of the French, but it happened that during the War, when the nation to which this name applies needed to be mentioned, the *London Times* adopted the Polish spelling as being more simple than that of the Czechs themselves. The Cyrillic users have slightly varying characters for that sound when it appears in their languages.

Another example is that of the well-known Czech composer Dvořák whose name is pronounced Dvorshak with a distinctly rolled r.

We also find the recurrence of ski, itch, and off, at the end of proper names very strange. These syllables mean in Polish, Russian, and Bulgarian respectively approximately what the Scandinavian suffix *son* means. Paderewski, Petrovich, and Petroff might all be translated Peterson.

While the various Slavic languages differ in appearance, and considerably in dialect, in a very short time any intelligent Slav can converse understandingly with another, each using his own language. It is quite com-

mon for Slavs of one group to insist that other Slavic languages are only dialects of their own.

In Bulgaria all Christians are members of the Greek Orthodox Church, although, on account of certain political-theological controversies, the other members of that hierarchy have claimed that the Bulgarians were not regular and they have been excluded from full participation in Church Councils. In the "Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes" only the Serbs and part of the Montenegrins belong to the Greek Orthodox Church. The other Christians are Roman Catholics.

A line running from Leningrad to Belgrad marks pretty accurately the division between the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic adherents. At the point of contact, however, there has been an ecclesiastical compromise by which members of the Greek Church retained their organization and ritual without modification, but acknowledged the Pope as the head of the Church. These are called technically Uniates which means *One with Rome*, but since it applies to other sects which have made the same concession these may be referred to as Greek Catholic. Since this adjustment was fundamentally made by political persuasion rather than by theological conversion it reappears in the political attitudes and allegiances of our immigrants.

From 1371 until approximately fifty years ago, and for some of them more recently, the Serbs and Bulgarians were part of the Turkish Empire. There are still many Mohammedans in both states, and, while they are unquestionably of similar blood to the Christians, they are generally considered by the others as Turks.

When independence from Turkey was secured, the Bulgarians were given a Hohenzollern king, but the Serbians got one of their own line. One result of this difference was that the Bulgarians were brought more into the course of Western culture, while the Serbs definitely did not desire outside influence. Two other agencies which resulted in the modernization of Bulgaria far beyond that of Serbia were Robert College in Constantinople, where many of the future leaders of Bulgaria studied, and the American missionary activity in Bulgaria which, while it made relatively few converts, nevertheless had considerable educational and social influence. The missionaries were excluded from Serbia.

Macedonia has been claimed by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, and has been one of the chief issues of the frequent Balkan conflicts. The people themselves, being mountaineers, have desired independence; but the fact that a large proportion of the immigrants in America who call themselves Bulgarians come from Macedonia, shows how intimate is the relation of Macedonia to Bulgaria. The result of the various treaties, however, is that a very small part of Macedonia has come to Bulgaria, with the consequence that Bulgaria is full of Macedonians whose political activity there corresponds to that of the Irish in Boston.

The conflicts which have so long prevailed in the Balkans and which have made the name synonymous with disorder have been largely the result of the activities and political maneuverings of England, France, Germany, and Russia for control. Many qualities pop-

ularly attributed to Jugo Slavs have been created by the competition of the advanced nations rather than by their own local problems. Both Serbia and Bulgaria are in the direct road to Constantinople and Bagdad.

Both of these countries are composed of peasants who have small holdings. Large landholders such as developed in most other regions never were numerous among the South Slavs. There is as yet very little industry, and very little foreign trade. In family and economic organization, especially among the Serbs, there remains much of the patriarchal and communal form that is found in some degree among all Slavs.

"The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes" also included the Montenegrins whose mountaineer independence will make their integration difficult. Besides these four nationalistic traditions and parallel dialectic differences, there are three religions, Greek, Roman, and Moslem, and three political histories. The old Kingdom of Serbia which constitutes the dominant centre of the present state is culturally the most backward of all except that of the Montenegrins. From the old Serbia we have practically no immigrants. Our Serbians came from Bosnia and Herzegovina where they had been under the government of Austria-Hungary. They are all Greek Orthodox. In fact the Croatians, who are their neighbors, were distinguished in the old census merely on the basis of being Roman Catholics. Their dialects are almost identical, though the Serbs use the Cyrillic and the Croatians the Latin alphabet. The Croatians, however, lived in more fertile territory and

have for a much longer time been in contact with Europe, so that they are culturally on a higher level than the Serbs though they too are nearly all peasants.

The Slovenes, whose numbers are the smallest, live in the north next to the Germans of Austria under whose influence they have been more than were the others. They are all Roman Catholics. In America they are often called "Griners," which is a name derived from Krain, the name of the province in Austria from which they came. I found one school principal in Ohio who had two hundred Slovenian pupils in his school and he did not know that they had any other name than "Griner."

Besides the similarity of language which fostered communication these three peoples had a common hatred for Austria. The day that the news came of the killing of Grand Duke Ferdinand by a Serbian student I wrote in my notebook that this was to have been expected. When our fear of immigrants who did not know English was at its height during the War, a Slovenian draftee in an American camp wrote the following letter to his brother after he had learned that he might be discharged as an "enemy alien."

"I received the civilian clothes sent me from Cleveland, and at the same time a thought occurred to me which has never left me, that I should feel ashamed to leave the army and go back to civil life. Indeed, how I love my young healthy life! How I long to be free again, going on my way without hearing the command of another! But, alas, am I justified in thinking of my own liberty and happy life when the moment is here that calls on every young man to bring liberty to others?

I am a Slovene myself, and my fathers and grandfathers never had any opportunity to fight for liberty. Indeed, they fought for hundreds of years under the command of the Hapsburgs to continue slavery and tyranny. . . . Goodbye, my beloved young life, I shall not return to my happy home until the day comes when I can see the liberated Jugo Slavia in a liberated world. Then I shall return, conscious that I have done my bit. If I perish—I am afraid I shall—let it be so. The only regret I have is that I do not possess hundreds of lives, giving them all for liberty. Dear brother, I have given the clothes to another who thinks less than I do.”

A glance at the map shows that the South Slavs are separated from all the others by an area occupied by Germans, Hungarians and Roumanians. There are, however, islands of Slavs to be found in the midst of populations outside the distinctive areas occupied by Slavs, just as there are islands of Germans and Hungarians among them. The animosity towards the Italians arises only from the area on the shore of the Adriatic.

To the north lies Czechoslovakia with its western part projecting well into the middle of Europe, and the eastern border reaching to the Carpathian Mountains. Prague, the capital, is as far from the eastern end of the country as it is from Paris. Within that distance may be found cultures from the most advanced to the most primitive.

The present Czechoslovak Republic consists of three distinctive groups, all of which have many representatives in the United States, the Czechs, Slovaks, and

Russinians. They vary in political, religious, and historical tradition, as well as in dialect.

The Czechs, who were generally known before the War as Bohemians, from their German name, are the westernmost of all Slavs, and they have shared completely in the cultural development of Western Europe. Lying between, and but a few hours distant from Dresden and Vienna, Prague has been an important city for many centuries. The University of Prague, which was founded in 1348, is older than any university in Germany, and has played an important part in the life of the people, both in the personalities it has produced and the traditions which surround it. Not only did it give an impetus to education, but it played a peculiar rôle in the maintenance of the language.

The two outstanding Czech personalities were Huss and Comenius. Huss, who was at one time Rector of the University and was burned at the stake in 1415 for attacking the immorality of the clergy, became a symbol both of nationality and of a religious protestantism which is still characteristic of the Czechs both in the Republic and in America. The Hussite wars gave Bohemia independence for two hundred years until 1620, early in the Thirty Years' War when it was completely lost. In 1621 many Bohemian nobles were executed and a ruthless campaign instituted to wipe out every trace of Hussite influence. About the middle of the last century, getting its formulation and expression largely among the immigrants in America, what is now called the Freethinking Movement began. This was

distinctly nationalistic and was anti-religious in order to be anti-Austrian. The defeat in 1620 seemed to bring an end to Bohemian history. As a matter of fact, it bred the attitudes which eventuated in the Czechoslovak Republic, and not only accounted for the Freethinkers in the United States, but also for the recent organization of the Czechslovak National Church as a schism from the Roman Catholic Church.

Comenius was a bishop in the Hussite Church and was exiled during the Thirty Years' War. His contribution to educational theory and practice was world wide, though it found its first application outside of Bohemia, and Comenius has been a special inspiration to the Czechs ever since. To the University and Comenius must be attributed the fact that Czech immigrants to America have considerably less illiteracy than almost all other immigrants.

Combined with the development of national feeling through religious interest was the stimulus which came through the effort of the Austrian government to Germanize the Czechs. The result was that the language became a symbol of freedom and self-respect as well as an instrument of communication. This situation is similar to that of a number of other immigrant groups who hold to their languages here because of their experiences in which language has been almost the only safeguard of nationality.

Bohemia shared with its German neighbors in the years just preceding the War in the rapid development of industrialization. There had previously been many

skilled workers among them, with the result that the Czechs have had economic advantages over their various cousins, both at home and in America.

In spite of the westernization of the Czechs they have a strongly Slavic consciousness, which was partly the result of their antagonism to the Germans, and partly of their familiarity with the extent and achievements of the Slavic world of which Russia was the leader. This sense of unity has led to the emulation of customs and interests that are Slavic rather than Teutonic even though their training has long been essentially the same as that of the Germans.

While the Czechs had at one time political sovereignty their Kingdom was in later days an integral part of the Austrian Empire; the Slovaks, on the other hand, had never had political experience. For many centuries they were merely a part of Hungary.

When Hungary became a coequal part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Hungarians practiced the same ruthless methods towards the Slovak language and culture that has generally prevailed when a more highly developed culture has come into dominant contact with a lower. By this very method, however, the Slovak national spirit was aroused.

The Slovaks live in a mountainous country which adjoins Bohemia. In the days after the Thirty Years' War, when the Czechs were oppressed, there was religious freedom in Hungary, and many Hussites went over there. The result is that all the peoples of Hungary present a situation almost unique in Europe of having had experience with a variety of religions instead

of one state religion. This in general is a liberalizing experience.

The cultural development of the Slovaks, besides the handicap of Hungarian domination, has been retarded by the fact of mountain isolation. Not only are mountain areas agriculturally deficient, but the inhabitants are out of contact. Since the education that was offered them in recent years was in the Hungarian language, this fact, together with their geographical isolation, resulted in very great illiteracy. There are a good many Protestant churches among them but the majority of the people are Roman Catholic. The difference in religion has hindered the development of solidarity. A good deal of stimulation has come from the United States, where Slovaks of various sections have been in contact with one another and where political ideas suggesting freedom have been more rampant. Slovaks have gone to Bohemia for education for many years. This fact was important in increasing the understanding between the Czechs and Slovaks. President Masaryk is of Slovak origin.

There are nearly twice as many Slovaks in the United States as there are Czechs. This is due to the fact that the economic opportunities at home were less, and also that, while in Bohemia there were many ways of preserving national values, in Slovakia there were none. There was a great deal of assistance given by both the Czechs and the Slovaks in America to the revolution which resulted in the establishment of the Republic. This help was in money, men, and counsel. One of the great problems was what should be the relations of

the two parts to the whole. The name was carefully chosen to give both full equality. Czechoslovak is one word without a hyphen to indicate that it is one people. Slovak is, of course, derived from Slav but it should not be confused with it.

It has not been easy to adjust satisfactorily in actual political organization these peoples of different experience. The Czechs of necessity took the leadership and have often been so tactless in its exercise that the Slovaks have resented it, and sought autonomy. This controversy has been reflected in the attitudes of Slovaks in America.

East of the Slovaks is an autonomous part of the Republic which is called Sub-Carpathian Russia. Its people originally seeped through the Carpathian Mountains from the Russian side, and they speak a dialect more closely related to the Russian. They use the Cyrillic alphabet and belong to the Greek Catholic Church. Since the arrangement between the Greek and Roman Churches was technical rather than religious, it did not disturb the habits of worship of the common people. The higher ecclesiastics, however, have succeeded in most cases in magnifying the conflict so that people, who if left to themselves might worship in each other's churches without knowing the difference, have the bitterest feelings of hostility for one another.

The Russianians, as they may be called, have lived for centuries under Hungarian rule, keeping their spoken language and their religion, but emerging culturally very little until some of them came to America. Now from fifteen to twenty per cent of them are in the

United States. Just before the Armistice, through the Greek Catholic Union with headquarters on the edge of Pittsburgh, a movement was started which resulted in a plebescite in America which voted to join the Czechoslovak Republic as an autonomous part. The population numbers about five hundred thousand, and is nationally conscious now for the first time. It is without literature, and very primitive in culture, but has been greatly stimulated by its new experience.

In spite of the wide ranges of culture variation which may be found in the divisions of Jugo Slavs and Czechoslovaks, they all have a close relation to peasant life, and peasants are similar wherever found. They have all had experience with alien rule. This makes them all hostile to their immediate neighbors, and at the same time tends to increase their feeling of solidarity. They all look to Russia as the ultimate leader of Slavic culture, although they share in much of the present western antagonism to the Soviet Republic. In social organization what is still peasant differs little whether in north or south, east or west. In music and decorative art of "folk" origin there is a vast amount. This has been and is being refined to a very high degree so that artists of the first degree are becoming numerous who build on the folk motive. This not only makes a contribution to the world's esthetic values, but also furnishes a basis for increased self-respect.

The ultimate organization of life in these countries has not yet been secured. There will be rapid evolution from now on, but, because of their geographical position, these two groups of Slavs will play an important

part in the development and popularization of what is distinctly Slavic, and at the same time enter quickly into the non-Slavic world of values. The more than two millions of their representatives in this country will greatly accelerate both tendencies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Emily Greene Balch, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*, 1910

CHAPTER XI

THE LATIN-AMERICANS

By A. W. PEZET,
Editor; Essayist.

§ I

BEFORE us stand three young men, newly come to our shores.

The first may be fair- or olive-skinned, blue- or brown-eyed, with hair that may be either dark or light. He speaks to us in Spanish, in a cultured voice, with animation and ease. He seems older than an American youth of the same age, less naïve, less boyish. A facile conversationalist, he can talk entertainingly on many topics. His knowledge and appreciation of art, literature, and music are far greater than that of the average American college boy.

Drawing him out, we find that he is irreligious, skeptical, even cynical. He seems much more interested in philosophy, politics, and women than in sport, business, or science. He can drink without getting drunk. His good taste and sobriety earn our respect, but his lubricity and obsession with sex disturb us. Also, he seems to us to lack what we should call a sense of humor. He has too much dignity and pride; he is too sensitive, too quickly resentful of our unintentional slights. We dis-

cover that a militant individualism is perhaps his dominant trait. His logical mind delights in abstractions and theories; he is impractical, lacking in that gift for compromise which is the mainspring of Anglo-Saxon practicality, common-sense, and coöperation. He regards our compromises disdainfully, and while appreciating their results, he calls them hypocrisies. Our get-together spirit and its usual manifestations fill him with amazement. When grown men clasp arms and sing songs at business luncheons he dismisses it as an incomprehensible form of infantilism. Though he is more talented than the average American, he is lacking in our stability, concentration, and driving force. We begin to wonder if he will not scatter his energies too widely or dissipate them too much for solid achievement. In the end, we decide that he is charming and likable but undependable. This young man is a Latin-American.

The second young man is dark-skinned, with Negroid features. We should call him a Negro, or at any rate colored. He speaks Portuguese. He is gay, witty, and, to us, amazingly courteous. His impeccable manners make us feel awkward and uncouth. He is quite unlike any colored person we have known; he has neither the servility nor the defiance of our Negroes. He is cultured and shares with the first young man a lively interest in the arts. He too is a Latin-American.

The third young man is stocky, reddish-brown skinned, with high cheek bones. His slightly oblique black eyes are brooding and dully sad. His black hair is straight and coarse. Given access to alcoholic bev-

erages he often becomes sodden drunk. He never laughs. He is melancholy and taciturn, suspicious, superstitious, sometimes fanatically religious. He has great physical strength and endurance. He may be a skilful artisan or mechanic. His language, however, is not intelligible to us, for he speaks only in Quechua. He too is a Latin-American.

The differences between these three young men go far deeper than those individual differences of character and appearance observable in any homogeneous group of men. They differ in race, in language, in nationality, in culture, in economic status, and in the environment in which they were nurtured; their backgrounds are dissimilar. And these young men are by no means the only types of Latin-Americans who might be described. Obviously there is something wrong, something dangerously inaccurate about a term that attempts to encompass such fundamental divergences in a single group.

§ 2

Like Europe, Latin-America is essentially a geographical expression. It is that portion of the Western Hemisphere which lies between the Rio Grande and Cape Horn, and it includes the two largest islands of the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea. This vast region, stretching from 32° north latitude almost to the Antarctic Circle, has an area of about nine million square miles—that is, more than the United States, Alaska, and Canada combined—and it contains approximately ninety million people. Though less populated than the

smaller area of Anglo-America, though far less populous than Europe or Asia, Latin-America occupies a high place in the world's economy. Indeed, the total value of its foreign trade is greater than that of Asia with its teeming millions, being surpassed only by Europe and Anglo-America.

Latin-America is a vast geographical region abounding in divergences and contrasts of topography and climate. Within its confines are to be found the two greatest river systems in the world, the greatest mountain range in the world and the second highest mountain peaks, the world's greatest tropical forest and most extensive desert. Its climate varies from the most torrid and humid to one of the driest and one of the coldest to be found anywhere on earth. Its natural products have enriched the world's economy as have the products of no other region in modern times. Without the special products of Latin-America, the existing economy, upon which rests our civilization, would be impossible to maintain.

Latin-America is inhabited by peoples representing three of the major racial divisions of mankind, speaking several different languages, and divided into twenty nations differing in their economic development, the details of their culture, their historical antecedents, and actual political status. Latin-America thus connotes one of the major divisions of the world and is comparable in scope to the term Europe or Asia. The first thing, therefore, that citizens of the United States must learn in their dealings with so-called Latin-Americans is that Latin-America is not a single nation, a single race,

or a single culture, but a complex of nations, races, and cultures, like Europe and Asia.

With this as the all-important starting point, let us proceed to an analysis of the Latin-American complex. For the term Latin-American stands for something more than the inhabitants of a specific geographical region, even though that something is subtle and difficult to define.

§ 3

Starting at the Rio Grande and traveling southward through the mainland of the Americas, we pass through the territories of the following independent and technically sovereign states: Mexico, Guatemala, Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile—in whose territory lies Cape Horn, the southernmost extremity of the Western Hemisphere and the most southern point attained by any of the continental land masses of the earth. Turning northward again, this time to the east, we are in Argentina, and as we pass on northward into vast Brazil, two small countries, Uruguay and Paraguay, stand like gate-posts to the right and left of us. North of Brazil and east of Colombia, we end our land journey on the Caribbean shores of Venezuela. Thence we travel on across the sea to the island republics of Santo Domingo, Hayti, and Cuba. In this swing around I have purposely not mentioned British Honduras in Central America, the Canal Zone which bisects the Republic of Panama, and the three Guianas,

British, Dutch, and French, lying to the east of Venezuela in the northeast corner of South America, for these states, being colonies of non-Latin-American nations, do not come within the scope of this survey.

— The contrasts between the various nations, I have enumerated are among the most startling to be found anywhere in the world. In area they run the gamut from Brazil, which is 250,000 square miles larger than continental United States excluding Alaska, to Salvador, which is one thousand square miles smaller than the State of New Jersey. Salvador, however, has a population density of 214.5 persons to the square mile, only slightly less than the populous State of New York, whereas Paraguay, with only 5.1 persons to the square mile, is more sparsely settled than Utah.

In Uruguay, Argentina, and Costa Rica, the population is almost purely white, the Indians, Negroes, and half-breeds forming a negligible minority. In Paraguay, the population is almost purely Indian and Mestizo (mixed Indian and white). In Hayti, there are no whites, more than fifty per cent of the population being pure Negroes and the rest Mulattoes.

— (So much for racial contrasts; the economic contrasts are no less startling.

— Buenos Aires, the capital of Argentina, is a great world metropolis of two million inhabitants. It is the second Latin city of the world—its population having outstripped that of Madrid and Rome, and being only slightly less than that of Paris—and third among the cities of the American continent. It boasts more millionaires than even New York. Its subway is the best

in the world; its public buildings surpass anything on our continent. For contrast, there is Tegucigalpa, capital of Honduras, a provincial town of 38,950 inhabitants—about the size of Stamford, Connecticut or Poughkeepsie, New York—with straggling, cobbled, and in some places grass-grown streets.

Politically the contrasts are as great. Chile and Argentina are proud, sovereign states, with more powerful armies and navies than Spain, Portugal, or any European nations other than the great world powers, while Nicaragua and Hayti are states whose sovereignty may be the will of an officer of the United States Marine Corps.

And these contrasts in material civilization have their counterparts in the realms of national psychology. Chile is one of the most aggressive and militaristic nations in the world, Brazil one of the most pacific and peace-loving. Peru, Mexico, and Colombia, in culture and mores, are struggling out of mediævalism. Argentina is ultra modern.

A few of these twenty nations have evolved stable political institutions; others, having failed, have returned to the rule of individual leaders. Some have achieved or are achieving a genuine national consciousness; there are others that will never become nations in the true meaning of the term. Some have evolved a genuine national culture; others import their culture with their dresses and Ford cars from Paris and New York.

It must be evident to anyone that it is impossible to describe the racial, cultural, economic background of

the typical Latin-American as one might describe the background of the typical Englishman, Frenchman, German, Scandinavian, or even Russian. There being no typical Latin-American, it becomes necessary at the start to discover the particular Latin-American one is dealing with. It is possible, however, for purposes of convenience, to divide Latin-America into groups whose points of similarity outnumber their points of difference.

§ 4

The largest group may be called the Indo-Spanish group because it is essentially Indian and Spanish. It includes Mexico, Guatemala, Salvador, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. Another group, which may be called the La Plata group, includes Argentina and Uruguay. Tropical Central America includes Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. The West Indian group includes Cuba and the Dominican Republic. (Porto Rico would also belong in this group were it not a territory of the United States.) Standing by themselves, too special to be associated in any way, are Brazil, Hayti, Venezuela, Chile, Paraguay, and Costa Rica.

Let us consider first the great Indo-Spanish group. The seven nations composing it resemble each other more than they differ from each other—in their racial make-up, their culture, mores, and general historical development. They are also somewhat alike in topography and climate. Mexico and Peru are the two most important and most typical members of this group.

Guatemala and Salvador are smaller and less typical individuals with Mexican affinities, just as Ecuador and Bolivia are Peruvian in their dominant characteristics. Colombia stands somewhat apart, but has been included in the group because, to the writer, the points of resemblance seem to outweigh the differences.

When the first Spaniards reached the American mainland at the beginning of the sixteenth century, two great native civilizations held sway. In the north, the Aztec-Toltec-Maya civilization dominated Mexico, Guatemala, and thrust southward in attenuated strength toward the Isthmus of Panama. In the south, the great Inca Empire embraced under a single government all of present-day Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, and extended its domain southward and eastward to the River Maule in Central Chile and to Tucuman in north-western Argentina. The highlands of Colombia at that time were occupied by the Chibchas, whose culture, though less advanced than that of the Incas, was more than probably derived from pre-Incaic sources.

The handful of Spaniards who conquered and despoiled these civilizations, ruthlessly destroying them and enslaving their peoples, were warlike adventurers, ignorant and fanatically religious. They had but two objectives: to obtain gold and other treasure for the aggrandizement of Spain and their personal profit, and to convert the heathen to Christianity. They differed utterly in temperament and in objectives from the peaceable English and Dutch settlers who came to North America to found new homes in which they might worship God according to their own beliefs.

The Spanish Conquistadores were biologically a picked group. It took daring and courage of the highest order to undertake such a colossal adventure. There is nothing in all history that equals their magnificent audacity. In evaluating the causes of their success, historians have stressed the efficacy of gunpowder and the terrorizing effects of horses, but the greatest weapon of the Conquistadores was a moral one, resident in themselves—their indomitable courage. In a very real sense the Spanish Conquest of Aztec and Inca was the last westward thrust of that great surge of warlike migration which ten centuries earlier had engulfed the western Roman Empire. It was also the last western invasion of the Saracen host; for in the veins of the Conquistadores there flowed not only the blood of the Celtic Iberians who had long inhabited the Peninsula, but also the blood of the Gothic conquerors of Iberia, of the Vandal conquerors of North Africa, and of the warlike Saracens who carried the Crescent of Islam into the heart of Europe and for centuries dominated Spain. Their prowess at arms had been tempered during centuries of bitter warfare. Their Christianity was Semitic rather than Christian.¹ Contact with Islam had modified it and differentiated it from the Christianity of other parts of Europe, if not in form then certainly in spirit. The culture that the Conquistadores brought with them to America was North African—that is, Moorish and Saracen—rather than western European.² And to this day, in such visible aspects as architecture, and in such manifestations as the position of women and the rela-

tion of the sexes, the culture of the Indo-Spanish group bears the imprint of the Near East and North Africa. There are scenes in Mexico and Peru that remind one with startling vividness of Morocco.

The women of the upper classes in Indo-Spain are the most cloistered to be found anywhere outside of North Africa and the Near East. They are wives and mothers to an exclusive degree that no American or European woman nowadays would tolerate. They are, furthermore, amazingly good wives and mothers. No group of women anywhere has higher standards of sexual morality. The men, on the other hand, are polygamous and promiscuous, traits derived from their Andalusian—that is, partly Moorish—ancestry. The white Indo-Spanish male has indulged his sexual appetite with native women ever since he first arrived womanless on the shores of America. Thus the initial miscegenation has continued to this day. The white family in Indo-Spain is patriarchal in its organization and of enormous size. The bonds of family are tightly drawn; one loves one's relations in Indo-Spain, not only because propinquity creates the bonds of affection, but because it would be inhuman and unthinkable not to. Since one's relations include third and sometimes even fourth degree cousins, there is little room for friendships outside the family. Loyalty to family takes precedence over other group loyalties.

Supported by the genuine and often bigoted faith of the women, and entrenched economically in the life of the nations, is the Roman Catholic Church, occupying

a position of authority and power it has no where else retained since the end of the Middle Ages. But again, the men present a paradox in that they are irreligious and skeptical.

Everywhere in Indo-Spain, the Church wields an enormous power, supported by great political and economic influence. The task of harmonizing its outlook and doctrines with the traditions and innate disposition of the native populations so as to promote the true welfare of the Indian and Mestizo masses has proved a difficult one. There is a widespread movement to readjust the situation, which in Mexico has assumed the proportions of a gigantic social revolution.

Enlightened Anglo-American Roman Catholics are aghast at what they consider the persecution of religion by radical agnostics in Mexico. But an enlightened Peruvian, himself a sincere and loyal Roman Catholic, wrote to the author recently that it would be disastrous for Indo-Spain if Roman Catholic citizens of the United States allowed their indignation to blind them to some of the complicating factors in the situation.

Macias Picavea, a Spaniard, once said that the chief characteristics of his people were the dominance of passion over will, and the substitution for the principle of justice of the socially inadequate sentiment of friendship and affection.³ The white Indo-Spaniard, a brilliant logician and abstract thinker, loves to theorize and to fit facts to his theories. He plans grandiose undertakings which he cannot accomplish because in him passion dominates will. To act effectively he must be stirred by the passion born of some tremendous emo-

tional urge. On the intellectual plane he remains a brilliant and facile thinker, unable to transmute thought into effective action.

Garcia Calderon, the great Peruvian sociologist and historian, maintains that a rampant, militant individualism was the chief characteristic of the Spanish Conquistadores.⁴ It was this fiery individualism that made possible and rendered successful their bizarre adventure in the New World. And it is this same quality that makes it impossible for their descendants to coöperate politically and economically, to sink personal predilections in the interest of a common end. Thus we find throughout Indo-Spain an almost complete absence of those associations and collective groupings which are so very characteristic of Anglo-Americans and which have contributed largely to the economic development and social progress of the United States.

During the seven hundred years' struggle with Islam it was impossible for feudalism to develop in Spain as it developed elsewhere in Europe. The city-state became the practical and inevitable political unit, and the Spaniard became a dweller in fortified towns. This, taken in conjunction with the Spaniard's individualism, gave rise to that tendency toward political diversification and separatism which today is the curse of Latin-America. A further result was to make the Spaniard's descendants in Indo-Spain as persistent townsfolk as the Jews. Like the Jew, the Indo-Spaniard does not appreciate or love the country. His passion is for the gregarious pleasures of city life. The cities of Latin-America are out of all proportion to the supporting

countryside. Absentee landlordism is everywhere a social problem. Throughout Indo-Spain the dominant whites live in a few large cities, leaving the country to the Indians, and their estates to Mestizo overseers.

In each of the seven countries of Indo-Spain, the whites are but a minority, albeit the minority that governs politically, exploits economically, and creates whatever public opinion may be said to exist. The whites are an oligarchy, a ruling caste. They occupy all the higher political positions, all the higher places in the hierarchy of the Church. They are also the members of a parasitic bureaucracy. For, once the Conquest became effective and the Vice-Royalty became firmly established, the more adventurous Spaniards pushed out to the conquest of outlying regions, and much of their blood was replaced by the blood of a swarm of sycophants and sinecure holders, who came to the Colonies to live on the government, and whose descendants continue the practice to this day.

The whites are also, or have been until very recently, the sole land owners; they are the bankers; they make up the learned professional classes. They are the officers of the armies, the poets, the painters, and especially, the professional politicians. Very few go into commerce and trade; to an amazing extent commerce and trade are in the hands of resident foreigners, many of whom are today Latin-Americans of several generations' standing. These foreign-origin merchants and business men are Italian, English, Scotch and Irish, German and Austrian, French and Belgian, and, since the War, Japanese. The Europeans have often married with

Creole⁵ women, and today descendants of the earlier arrivals are good Latin-Americans, indistinguishable except by their names.

In 1912, F. A. Pezet called attention to the fact that at that time the President of Peru was Billinghurst; two Justices of the Peruvian Supreme Court, Elmore and Washbourne; President of the Lima Chamber of Commerce, Gallagher; Assistant Secretary of State, Althouse; Consul General in New York, Higginson; Chargé d'Affaires in Great Britain, Lembcke; a leader in Congress, Solomon.⁶ There was also a time recently when many of the Ambassadors, Ministers, and other representatives of Latin-America in Washington bore non-Spanish and non-Portuguese names.⁷

This does not mean that there is any large proportion of non-Spanish blood among the whites of Indo-Spanish America. These foreign-origin whites are numerically and biologically unimportant. Their significance is economic. Because they were willing to go into trade and commerce in countries in which the Creole element regarded such occupations with repugnance, they have achieved prominence by dint of their economic superiority. It was Edward Alsworth Ross, the American sociologist, who first commented upon the ironic fact that the region of the world richest in natural resources was settled by a people with no aptitude for their exploitation;⁸ and, I may add, whose undeniably high talents lay in professional and artistic fields which cannot thrive except in regions whose economic wealth has been previously exploited.

The white Indo-Spaniard is not only unfitted by tem-

- perament to exploit the resources of his country, but he has been prevented from any exploitation by the existence of the Indian masses. Slavery is its own punishment. There is no more fundamental law than that the existence of a slave class economically debases the master class by making it dependent upon the slaves. In Indo-Spain a white man cannot carry his own suit case to and from the station, he cannot carry a package from market or shop. He must hire an Indian to carry it for him; to do so himself would jeopardize his social standing. Something faintly analogous to this exists in our own Southern States. In Latin-America generally, and particularly in the Indo-Spanish group, it is carried to an unbelievable extreme.

- Of course, the Indians are not really slaves. Slavery was abolished in Latin-America earlier than in the United States. But though they are theoretically and legally free men, vast numbers of the Indians are no better off than slaves. Through the operations of the existing system of peonage they are kept in debt to their employers, and so, virtually in bondage to masters. Steeped in complete illiteracy, they are unaware of, and incapable of discovering, their legal rights.

They are, nevertheless, not without champions and sympathizers. Everywhere throughout Indo-Spain there exists a more or less developed "Indianista" movement, which aims to redeem and liberate the Indian through education. The movement has assumed tremendous proportions in Mexico, where the Liberal government of Calles is making an earnest effort to give the Indian a square deal.

The World War had a shattering effect upon the old social order throughout Indo-Spain. Woodrow Wilson's doctrine of self-determination of peoples and the various propagandist restatements of democratic principles had far-reaching repercussions south of the Rio Grande. Everywhere the authority of the white oligarchies is being undermined. The Mestizo middle class is becoming more powerful. As a result of unprecedented war-time prosperity more and more Mestizos are reaching high places. In the larger cities labor is becoming articulate and organized, and in recent years strikes have become frequent. Indo-Spain is in a social ferment whose end no man can tell. The inertia and the mediaevalism that have endured for centuries are giving way.

§ 5

I have dwelt at length upon the background of Indo-Spain because it is the most nearly typically Latin-American and the most different from our own social milieu of any of the Latin-American groups. In briefly commenting upon the others, I shall stress the points of difference from the dominant type. The reader must bear in mind that the fundamental culture is everywhere the same, modified only to the extent indicated.

Thus, Chile is in some respects an integral part of the culture complex of Indo-Spain. But the numerous divergences require special treatment.

In Chile the white oligarchy is more organized, self-conscious, more powerful, and numerically much more

important than in either Mexico or Peru. In Chile the pure Indians are a small and vanishing minority, and the Indian problem does not exist. The warlike Araucanians who inhabited Chile south of the River Maule were never conquered either by the Incas or the Spaniards. Comparable in culture and temperament with our own Iroquois, their fate has been somewhat similar. Some of their blood has mixed with the whites to form the Chilean Mestizo or "roto" class. These Chilean rotos have none of the "gloomy passivity" ⁹ of the Peruvian Indians. They are bellicose and self-assertive. They are, too, about the most dishonest group of people to be found anywhere in the civilized world. Their propensity toward thievery has created an embarrassing internal problem in Chile, and it makes them most unpleasant enemies when, as soldiers, they are at war with Chile's neighbors.

On the other hand, Chilean white blood has been enriched with valuable elements. The Spaniards who form the dominant nucleus of the whites are largely Basques, a positive-minded, energetic people, quite different from the pleasure-loving, Moorish Andalusians. To this nucleus have been added large numbers of industrious Germans and Anglo-Saxons. German influences are dominant in the army, in education, and in the southern agricultural regions. British influence is important in commerce and trade. Though the culture and the mores are still predominantly Spanish, Chile is the least Latin of any of the Latin-American nations. Chile has developed a sort of feudal society peculiarly its own. The analogies, according to Garcia

Calderon, are with the first Roman Republic and early England.¹⁰ Chile is a true oligarchy.

§ 6

Passing to the economically most important La Plata group, including Argentina and Uruguay, we find profound differences from the Indo-Spanish Latin-American type.

In these countries there is practically no Indian blood at all. Uruguay is purely white, and in Argentina the non-whites do not amount to five per cent of the population. In the United States there is over eleven per cent of colored blood, yet we consider ourselves a white nation.

In the La Plata region there were no organized Indian nations in pre-Columbian times, only nomads of the plains, as in the greater part of the United States. There was no native culture to exert its influence upon the whites; there were no gold mines to be exploited with Indian labor. At first entirely a cattle and sheep country, and now also one of the chief agricultural regions of the world, the plains of the La Plata were settled as the United States and Canada were settled, not conquered like Mexico and Peru. It was a settlement and development in some respects not unlike that of our States between the Mississippi and Rocky Mountains. Even our cowboys have their counterparts in the picturesque Gauchos of the Argentine pampas,—mighty horsemen of mixed Spanish, North African, and Indian blood. But today the Gaucho, like the cowboy, is

disappearing before the advance of railways and Ford cars.

The economic development of the La Plata region has been meteoric. Not even our Middle West has grown so fast in wealth and population. The original Spanish Colonial blood of the La Plata has been profoundly modified by the immigration of Spaniards, largely Basques, North Italians, French, Germans, English, and even other European elements such as Swedes and Welsh. Whereas in Indo-Spain the foreign-born and foreign-origin population is nowhere as much as 5 per cent of the total, in Argentina 85 per cent of the people are foreign-born or the descendants of recent immigrants. Of these the Italians are by far the largest group. Italian names in high places in Argentina are becoming increasingly commonplace. The Spanish spoken in Argentina is the most different in pronunciation from pure Castilian of any of the Latin-American variants.

The continuous influx of foreigners is modifying the original Spanish culture of the La Plata region. Though the culture is as Latin as that of France, Spain, or Italy, it is lacking in those mediæval characteristics peculiar to Indo-Spain. Argentina and Uruguay are, each in its way, ultra-modern nations.

In Argentina the upper classes are upstart and *nouveau riche*. Here we have a genuine plutocracy in place of the aristocracy of Chile, Peru, and Colombia. The rich and multifarious colors of Indo-Spanish life are absent. Indeed, in Argentina all colors are lost in the all pervading color of gold.¹¹

Buenos Aires has been called "a pretentious city in a pastoral republic." It has been dubbed a "plaster Paris." And it is in truth the sort of city that might have been produced by a misalliance between Chicago and Paris. But when all witticisms are spent, one must admit that the Latin artistic genius has produced, in a country at the economic stage of development of our Northwest and Southwest a generation ago, a city with more beautiful buildings than any on the American continent, and entirely lacking in that mushroom-growth hideousness of the Anglo-American mid-West.

The ultra modernism of Uruguay resembles that of Australia and New Zealand. It manifests itself in social legislation in advance of anything attempted in this country. Moreover, this legislation is not the result of hysterical, fanatical propaganda but of sober, scientific research and discussion. Uruguay is easily the most enlightened of the Latin-American nations.

Colombia, which I included in the Indo-Spanish group, differs slightly from the type in the presence of large numbers of Negroes in the hot lowlands. It differs also in certain peculiarities due to the greater isolation of its capital, situated as it is on a remote and inaccessible highland.

The upper class in Colombia is the most "insular," the most conservative, the least touched by foreign influences, of the Latin-American aristocracies. The Colombian aristocrat speaks the purest Spanish, and clings most tenaciously to the ancient colonial ways. Due also to the upland isolation, the Mestizo class in

Colombia comes nearer to being a new race, a true fusion of races, than anywhere else in Latin-America.

§ 8

- Tropical Central America, which includes Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama, is economically the most backward region in continental, inhabited America.
- This is due in part to the repressive effects of climate, but it is probably also due to the racial admixtures.
- The culture and mores are the same as in Indo-Spain, but modified by the absence of a genuine white aristocracy, by the presence of a large Negro element, and by the degree to which mixing has taken place between Negroes and Indians. All observers agree that the Zambo (Indian and Negro) has the faults of both Negroes and Indians and few, if any, of the virtues of either. Though the few whites and the larger number of near-whites predominate in the upper classes, there are no clearly stratified racial demarcations. In recent years the Spanish culture of the region has been further modified by American influence, which is paramount in Panama, and important in Nicaragua.

§ 9

- Cuba and the Dominican Republic differ from Tropical Central America in the almost complete replacement of the Indian by the Negro. In Cuba, Spanish culture, in spite of the recentness of the emancipation from Spain, is being completely modified by American in-

fluence. Except in interior districts, Cuba is almost as American as Porto Rico.

§ 10

We come now to the individual nations which present special cases: Venezuela, Costa Rica, Paraguay, Hayti, and Brazil. The first four may be briefly described.

Venezuela is a cultured hybrid standing between Colombia and Tropical Central America. The white element is small and the Negro element large.

Costa Rica, like the La Plata region, is almost purely white. The Indians have been absorbed into the white population, and the Negroes, few in number, are confined to the lowlands. The culture is Spanish, but the predominant whiteness and favorable climate (most of Costa Rica is sub-tropical by reason of elevation) has permitted much greater progress and stability than in contiguous Nicaragua or Panama.

Paraguay is an Indian republic. There are practically no Negroes in the country and scarcely any pure whites. Here the white blood has been absorbed into the Indian mass. Though Spanish is the official language, Guarani is spoken by the masses, and even the classes use it as a secondary tongue. Because the Guaranis were not highly civilized, like the Mayas and Incas, the Spanish culture has deeply impressed itself upon the whole mass of the population.

The development of Paraguay has been profoundly affected in every way by the bitter war with Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina, which decimated the males and left

the small republic with a greater proportion of females than any other population in the world.

Hayti differs entirely and in every respect from the rest of Latin-America. It was not settled by Iberians but by the French. The aboriginal Arawaks were early exterminated, and Negroes were imported. These soon became the dominant element in the colony. At the time of the French Revolution, they revolted, and in one of the bloodiest wars in history they extirpated the whites and even the lighter Mulattoes. Today Hayti is a Black republic, like Liberia in Africa. Its culture is a mixture of French and African. The language is French.

§ II

— Brazil, to which we shall devote this section, is really deserving of a whole chapter. Not only is it the largest single national unit in Latin-America and the most populous, but it also differs from the rest of Latin-America in many notable ways.

— In the first place, Brazil was settled by Portuguese, not Spaniards, and its language and culture are Portuguese, not Spanish. Though Portuguese culture had a common Iberian origin with that of Spain, there are important minor differences which it is not possible to go into in a concentrated article of this sort.

— In the second place, Brazil is the only one of the Latin-American countries that did not have to fight for its independence. When Napoleon's armies invaded Portugal, the Royal Family fled to Rio de Janeiro, and

the King of Portugal became Emperor of Brazil. The later separation of the two states was pacific. This American Empire of Brazil endured until 1889, when the present Federal Republic was established as the result of a by no means sanguinary revolution. The pacificism of Brazil is thus rooted in history.

As in the United States and in the La Plata, the Brazilian Indians were savages who were killed off or driven westward. But the heart of the Amazonian basin is today still an untracked and largely unexplored forest inhabited by Indian savages.

During the Colonial period, hundreds of thousands of Negroes were imported, and these merged with the whites to form the present-day, preponderantly Mulatto population. The Portuguese have never shown an aversion to miscegenation with Negroes; Portugal is the only European nation with any Negro blood. Brazil may be said to be the one important country that knows no color line whatever. To be sure, there is a white Brazilian aristocracy, one of the most exclusive in the world; but its exclusiveness is a family matter. No man in Brazil is debarred from high places by reason of his color. The color of Brazil is not so much stratified in classes as it is by latitude. The pure whites are concentrated in the three temperate provinces of the far south. As one travels northward the population grows darker. In the far north it is almost purely Negro.

The essential characteristic of the Brazilian of all colors is his cultured courtesy, his impeccable good manners, and sincere kindness. There is a mellowness, a softness, a warmth to the Brazilian psychology,

a spontaneous gaiety, which is peculiarly its own. Brazil has escaped the anarchy and the rigorous, sanguinary internal disputes of the other sections of Latin-America. Dom Pedro II, Emperor from 1840 to 1889, was a kindly, tolerant gentleman who typified the best of Portuguese culture. And something of his spirit has impregnated the Brazilian nation, and manifests itself today in Brazilians of all colors.

Within recent years, non-Portuguese elements have begun to play a part in Brazilian life. There is a region of about eight thousand square miles in which ninety per cent of the population are Germans or of German extraction. But it is significant of Brazilian nationality, that this strong German element was not able to prevent the entrance of Brazil into the World War on the side of the United States and the Allies.

—There is, however, a decided separatist movement in southern Brazil, which broke out into civil war a few years ago. But the movement is neither racial nor national, but strictly economic. The south, the progressive region of Brazil, wearies occasionally of carrying the bag for the more backward north.

§ 12

— Though many parts of Latin-America are economically backward, though these nations are struggling with racial and social problems of tremendous significance and extraordinary complexity, it would be a great mistake to assume that they are without the fundamentals of a unifying culture and the elements of a high and enduring civilization. Throughout this vast

region, men live under the essential unity of similar laws, laws derived from the Roman law through Spain and Portugal. Though the conquered Amerindian has in some ways conquered his conquerors, though there are a million persons in Mexico who speak Mayan and millions in Peru and Bolivia who speak only Quechua and Aymará, there is an essential linguistic unity, for Spanish and Portuguese are similar languages.

The literature of Spain has been tremendously enriched by the poets, essayists, novelists, and dramatists of Spanish-America. Even backward, Mestizo Nicaragua gave birth to Ruben Dario, one of the greatest lyric writers of all time, the founder of a new school of poetry which in ten years transformed Spanish poesy, the glory of modern Spanish literature. Others have followed in his steps. Santos Chocano of Peru is known critically in Europe as the Walt Whitman of South America. There is not a nation of Latin-America that has not produced at least one great literary name. Together, though unfamiliar to North American eyes and ears, they create a literary galaxy that is the equal of that of any group in the modern world.

Bacaflor, the Peruvian (half Indian) painter, whose notable portrait of the elder J. P. Morgan hung for a long time in the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art, has recently been made a Member of the French Academy. He is ranked by French critics as one of the greatest of living portrait painters.

Even in science the genius of Latin-America is beginning to assert itself. In Mexico and Peru, two eminent native archaeologists are doing notable work in

researches into the past of their peoples—for both of them are men with Indian blood.

During the World War many Latin-Americans distinguished themselves in the Allied Armies. It was a Peruvian aviator who first flew over the Alps.

Since the end of the Colonial period, the influence of Spanish culture has notably declined. It is French culture in all its aspects that today is the paramount influence in Latin-America. Our influence, except in the Caribbean region, in spite of American moving pictures and commercial penetration, is negligible. Between Anglo-Americans and Latin-Americans of all sorts there lies the chasm of dissimilarity of culture. For all the modification we have suffered through immigration, our culture remains essentially Anglo-Saxon. Just so, Latin-America, in spite of the congeries of races and their mixtures, remains Latin in culture. Though it grows daily less Spanish under French and in some regions Italian influence, it grows daily more Latin.

This, then, is the only justification for the use of the term Latin-American. Latin-Americans are Latin-Americans in the same sense and to the same degree that citizens of the United States and Canada, no matter what their origin and race, are Anglo-Americans.

If we are to sum up so diverse a people it can best be done in the words of the Peruvian, Garcia Calderon. The Latin-American, he wrote, "has enthusiasm, sociability, and optimism. . . . But the character of the average citizen is inferior to his imagination and intelligence."

NOTES

- *(1) Garcia Calderon, *Latin America, Its Rise and Progress*. English translation by Bernard Miall. F. Fisher Unwin, London, 1913. Chapter 1, pp. 40-43
- (2) *Ibid.*, p. 41
- (3) Quoted by Havelock Ellis in his *Soul of Spain*
- (4) Same as (1) and (2). Chap. I
- (5) A Creole is often incorrectly used in this country to mean a person with colored blood. A Creole is a white native of Latin-America. Thus the Creoles in Louisiana are whites of French descent. Just as Creole is the white native, so Mestizo is mixed white and Indian; Mulatto, mixed white and Negro; Zambo, mixed Indian and Negro
- *(6) Federico A. Pezet, *Contrasts in the Development of Nationality in Anglo- and Latin-America; Latin-America*. Clark University Addresses. G. E. Stechert & Co., New York, 1913, p. 17
- (7) In 1922, out of fifty-two names of Latin-American diplomats, excluding Hayti, listed in the *Diplomatic Register*, 7 were French, 3 Italian, 2 English, 2 Irish, and 1 German. A total of 15 non-Iberian to 37 Iberian names. At that time the Ambassadors of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Peru all revealed non-Iberian origins in their names
- *(8) Edward Alsworth Ross, *South of Panama*. The Century Co., New York, 1905
- (9) *Ibid.*
- (10) Same as (1), (2), and (4)., p. 165
- *(11) Clayton Sedgwick Cooper, *Understanding South America*, George H. Doran, New York, 1918

*Recommended as Bibliography

CHAPTER XII

THE ORIENTALS

By J. MERLE DAVIS,

General Secretary, Institute of Pacific Relations.

THE background of the European immigrant is near enough to that of the American to be intelligible, yet sufficiently different to be picturesque. The life and institutions which the European immigrant brings with him bear certain fundamental resemblances to those of America. The American measures these features by his own and the immigrant evaluates his adopted country in much the same way. Definite adjustments are needed, the re-fitting of parts, but the general scheme of the picture is there and with patience the details may be filled into their proper places.

This process requires time and imagination, but it is feasible because American customs and culture have evolved from European stock and though flowering various blossoms the American tree-trunk roots back into common European soil.

Moreover, the basic concepts of life and the institutions of most of the European peoples, for example, the concepts of God, of the state, marriage, the home, chivalry, the right of trial, the common law, monogamy, and monotheism have a certain similarity. The lan-

guage and syntax of many of the peoples of Europe are cognate, while most of them derive inspiration from the culture patterns of Greece and Rome.

The Oriental immigrant, however, is a product of a different trunk root. It is probable that scores, if not hundreds, of thousands of years separate the Oriental of the Far East from the racial stocks of Europe. We speak of the Chinese as having nearly four thousand years of continuous, recorded history, but back of the records there is reason to believe that the ancestors of the Chinese were living in the basins of the Yangtse and Yellow rivers for periods vastly antedating history. These immense spaces of time have produced an individual in eastern Asia of a different aspect from the European. Moreover, they have evolved a different type of mental life, a different organization of society and diverse institutions and standards of human values. As expressed by a Chinese statesman, "We Chinese have been setting like cement in deep moulds for thousands of years, and it is unreasonable to expect us to liquefy ourselves and run off into new patterns in one or two decades."

The Europeans also during the same period were setting in their own characteristic racial patterns and were fashioning channels in which the tide of life was flowing in an opposite direction. After the lapse of many millenniums the Western tide has met one that is flowing out of an awakened East and a period of severe adjustments is taking place.

The differences between Orient and Occident are in many aspects so striking that each has been rendered

uninteresting to the average mentality of the other because of the diverse standards used in measuring one another. The blonde hair, bearded faces, huge stature and heavy voices of Westerners were not picturesque to the Japanese of seventy years ago, they were grotesque, for they bordered on the realm of the myth, the monstrous and the inhuman. This is evidenced by the names that were applied to the foreigner which are still in use in certain parts of Japan;—"Yabanjin" or "Barbarian," "Ketojin," "Hairy Monster," and "Ijin," "Different Being." On the other hand, the first Japanese who visited America in the entourage of the Government commissions to the West seemed equally strange to the street crowds of the great cities, by whom they were frequently dubbed, "Monkeys," while the queue of the Chinese rendered him for half a century an object of ridicule to thoughtless Occidentals. Though this physical accommodation between East and West has made considerable progress, there remain the economic, social and cultural adjustments between these two great divisions of the human race. The immigrant acts as the spear point and is the pioneer in these more difficult adjustments, paying a heavy price, since he is caught between the upper and lower mill-stones of two civilizations as they grind upon one another.

A basic factor conditioning the whole range of adjustments of the Oriental to American life is the sharply contrasted social organization of East and West. The Western social order is built around the individual as the unit of society. In America the home, community and state are evaluated by their adaptation for produc-

ing efficient and happy individuals. In the Far East the converse holds. The individual is valued in the degree to which he contributes to the prosperity and safety of the social unit to which he belongs,—the family, village and nation. After ages of craftsmanship upon the basis of these diverse social ideals, the West offers the World its masterpiece,—the individual, and the East presents its finished product,—the family. The trend of history is forcing upon both East and West the necessity of proving whether these two patterns of society can be utilized in constructing a new pattern, embodying the excellencies of both, or whether it is feasible for these diverse concepts of life to move harmoniously forward in parallel courses.

Both the Chinese and Japanese inherit the background of the family group as the social unit. This accounts in part for the extraordinary vitality of their institutions and the amazing persistence of these Oriental races. Unquestionably the individual has paid the price, but the institution has endured as an imposing monument to that sacrifice. The Far East has emphasized obedience, loyalty, and conformity to environment rather than independence, initiative, and freedom of choice. The individual is caught in a network of relationships and obligations that check him at every step. In a system where a wide clientele of relatives, connections by marriage and dependents may legally attach themselves to the ambitious youth at the first signs of approaching prosperity, initiative is discouraged. A society so closely integrated compels the individual to think twice before doing anything, to estimate the pos-

sible consequences of his action upon his group, for he is not in the western sense of the term a "free moral agent."

It is difficult for the Anglo Saxon to realize the full force of the handicap of this Oriental social background upon the immigrant as he steps into the individualistic atmosphere of American life. The checks, inhibitions, limitations, and standards of personal values and personal conduct inherited through a hundred generations have disappeared and in their place substitutes are handed him that seem peculiar and perilous.

The family system of the Orient has developed a special attitude toward individual suffering and a special technique for social problems. As the unit of society with responsibility for its members the family must deal with the social ills of its own circle. The absence of hospitals, poorhouses, homes for aged, insane asylums, and houses of correction and reform schools in old Chinese society did not indicate that the people were without human sympathy or were callous to suffering. It indicated a people who had organized their life on a totally different social basis from Western society. It indicated the acceptance of a crushing load of social responsibility by the Chinese family, for the sick, the infirm, the aged, the insane and defective and indigent were a first charge upon the household. The Chinese accept such burdens stoically and carry them to the best of their ability and discount a civilization which substitutes a public institution for the personal, often filial, responsibilities and ministrations of a family for its members.

The control of the group upon the conduct and welfare of the individual Oriental immigrant in America is shown in the town and county records of the Pacific Slope. An examination of the books of the Probation Office of Santa Clara County, California, in June, 1924, revealed the fact that during a four-year period terminating in that month among the many hundreds of cases of delinquency among children under 18 years of age not a child of Oriental parentage was listed. The roster of the County Poorhouse for the five-year period ending in June, 1924, contained the name of no Japanese and but one Chinese. The Sheriff stated that it was a tradition that no Japanese had ever been admitted to the Santa Clara County Poorhouse in the forty years of the colony's history. During the period in question, the Oriental population of the county has fluctuated from three to five thousand.

This factor of social control of the Oriental immigrant and the self-discipline which has kept him from being a charge upon the American community, though partly due to his self-consciousness and his pride in maintaining a clean racial record, is unquestionably an important background that he brings with him to America. It also offers a striking contrast to the experience of the Pacific Slope in dealing with other immigrant groups with which the Oriental has lived side by side.

The Chinese brings with him a naïve attitude toward law and government that baffles the American authorities and injures his reputation as a law-abiding member of the community. There is need of understanding

the social and legal background of the Chinese immigrant before he can be intelligently dealt with by magistrate or police and before he can be justly judged by public opinion. The body of law that the Chinese recognizes has grown up on the basis of immemorial custom and the social and official exactions of his community. He is, as a rule, a peaceful and law-abiding person, but his legal relationships have been satisfied in his old environment by the paying of his debts, supporting his relatives and meeting the taxes collected by the local magistrate. Such shadowy and remote institutions as federal or state courts mean nothing to him and the laws which they impose arouse no sense of obligation.

"I wish you would tell me how it is that you Chinese who are so honorable in all your business transactions are willing to lie like troopers when it comes to helping one of your friends over the line from Canada," said an immigration inspector to a prosperous Chinese merchant of a Pacific Coast city. The Chinese answered, "Very easy to tell. If I tell you business lie, it hurt you and make you much loss. If I tell immigration lie, it no hurt you, no hurt anybody, no make you loss, no make anybody loss. God never say, 'John Chinaman no can come inside America.'"

The statutes upon which the Chinese in America usually make shipwreck are not those dealing with personal obligations, but are federal statutes relating to immigration, smuggling or the selling of opiates, or those which cut squarely across inherited social instincts such as gambling and white-slaving, offenses which are not rated as crimes in old Chinese society.

The ambition of the Oriental immigrant for his children and his desire that they shall have the best advantages that America affords is a characteristic that he shares with many other immigrant groups and reveals him at his best in the new environment. The proportion of Chinese and Japanese children that are sent to high school and college is surprisingly large in Hawaii and in continental United States. The older generation of immigrants are convinced that education must be had at all costs for their children to enable them to secure advantages which have been denied themselves. The American is constantly impressed by the solicitude of Oriental parents for their children. In Stockton, California, the story is told of the Chinese ranch foreman who notified the owner of his decision to quit. The owner questioned the man as to the reason for his dissatisfaction. The Chinese replied, "Yes, wages very good, work easy, house comfortable, master very kind, but all same must quit. I have two nice baby, now three, five year old, all time run round ranch. Ranch boys all time very bad talk. Too much 'God Damn' round little baby. All same must quit."

To one who has lived among the Japanese both in Japan and in America the influence of his physical background on his life as an immigrant is obvious. With a climatic background and mode of life that points to a southern origin, the Japanese instinctively shuns winter's cold and is irresistibly drawn to balmy latitudes. His insular background has created in him a love of the sea. He is by nature a bold sailor, a skilled fisherman, adept with boats and nets. These traits

coupled with his industry, have virtually given him a monopoly of the fishing industry of the Pacific Coast, from Mexico to Alaska. His agricultural background has brought him to the front as a farmer, especially with respect to irrigated crops and truck gardening. Built close to the ground with short legs and back, natural selection has destined the Japanese to crowd the long-gearred Yankee out of the berry field. Centuries of training in craftsmanship with brush, hammer and chisel have produced a deftness, an unerring touch and an artistic judgment that brings him to the front in occupations that require high coördination between brain and hand. The economic background of the Oriental immigrant, the low overhead of his home and the working habits and team-like organization of his household place him at a great advantage in competition with the American agriculturist. It is at this point that the thrifty and hard-working Japanese has laid himself open to the most persistent and logical opposition that has been directed against him.

However, there are other factors in the background of the Japanese immigrant that condition his adjustments in American society quite as fully as those we have mentioned, though by their nature they are not readily recognized. The Japanese possess a remarkably rich and diverse culture inheritance. The mores of Malay and Mongol, South Sea Islander and Tartar, Confucian ethics, Buddhist imagery, Shinto and Christianity are all in that inheritance. It is this diversity that makes the race difficult to understand, but by the same token interesting. Woven all through the racial

background of the Japanese is the massive institution of feudalism which for a period of eight hundred years permeated like the sixteen-pound pressure of the atmosphere every nook and cranny of Japanese life. It is as impossible to understand Japanese social institutions and psychology without reference to feudalism, as it would be to appraise British character and institutions without a study of English history from the Norman Conquest to Charles the First. A study of Japanese feudalism throws special light upon the adjustments of the Japanese to the American social and political order, for it furnished the school in which he was trained.

The old clan ties are still strong among the Japanese. — A majority of the first immigrants to America belonged to the same feudal district, Hiroshima, in Western Japan. Established in agricultural groups on the Pacific Coast, their community organization frequently became a source of resentment and even of suspicion to American neighbors. An official of the Farm Bureau of San Diego County, California, relates the following: "From 1912 to 1915 we went through a series of droughts here that nearly wrecked the county. At the end of the first dry year a number of White farmers failed and moved away. The Japanese, however, stayed and worked all the harder. At the close of the second dry season, fully half of the White farmers had left, but not a Japanese budged. They were suffering just as much as the whites, but they were organized and the Americans were not. After three dry years there were very few American farmers left in San Diego County, but the Japanese had not quit. The

members of the colony were helping each other. They had their own coöperative association. Those that had money loaned to those that were broke. Japanese seed stores and shops were advancing on credit and Japanese banks were lending on easy terms. They weathered that drought not because they were better farmers than the White men, but because they pulled together. The White men would not trust or help each other when the pinch came."

- The Japanese is a born coöperator. Centuries of team work under feudal discipline have made him an efficient cog in a machine. They have trained him also to take orders from a superior rather than to stand on his own feet. This is why the Japanese in America stick together in colonies. It is also the basis of the Japanese Association of the Pacific Coast. This organization does much of the thinking and guiding of the immigrants, from methods of agriculture and child nurture to legal advice and help in getting passports. This social solidarity and dependence upon paternalistic leadership has retarded the assimilation of the Japanese in America. It has also provoked friction and suspicion among Americans who from the background of their own individualistic social order interpret this group functioning of the Japanese as evidence of political control from Tokyo.

- Another important inheritance of the Japanese immigrant may be placed at the door of feudalism—his natural reserve, suspicion and social inhibitions. The feudal castle with its encircling moats was so constructed that the defenders had every possible advantage over

an attacking force. The drawbridge and portcullis were approached by successive bridges that led backward and forward over the protecting moats and were open to the defenders' fire. Eight hundred years of feudal schooling, with its hereditary feuds, mortal rivalries and ceaseless espionage developed in the Japanese a "portcullis mind," acquisitive, observing, defending, but skillfully withholding itself. This is revealed in the home architecture, in social customs and in the attitude toward strangers. It has also left its mark upon the facial aspect, the thought processes and language of the race. In a community teeming with spies, children were drilled in an impassivity of face, a reticence with strangers, a concealment of emotion that still conditions the average Japanese in his social reactions.

The Japanese language developed many polite phrases and conventional verbal fencings calculated to convey little meaning, to hold a situation in suspense and to give both parties time for discovering the real intentions of the other and for preparing for action. Where the Anglo Saxon gets to his point with the fewest possible words, the Japanese arrives by more leisurely processes. His speech takes him over the castle moat and back by the double approach. He uses two negatives in conveying an affirmative meaning. Where the American father says, "Johnny, you must go to school today," the Japanese parent says, "Tarosan, the not going to school today must not be." In English a negative question requires a negative answer, but in Japanese it receives an affirmative reply. When an American says to his dentist, "Doctor, you are not go-

ing to hurt me much are you?" he usually replies, "No, I won't hurt you." The Japanese dentist, however, when faced with the same question, answers, "Yes, I won't hurt you." The point is not that one race lies and the other does not. Both dentists are probably lying, but they lie in a different syntax. Such variant mind sets and thought patterns, expressed by unaccustomed facial technique and language responses, breed distrust and misunderstanding and seriously handicap the Oriental in his adjustments to the Western environment.

To what extent these racial traits are capable of change in succeeding generations under American training is the most important problem of the Oriental stock that is developing on American soil. Accumulating evidence in Hawaii and on the Pacific Slope of North America shows that the process of change in inherited racial traits in children of Oriental parentage is accelerated or retarded in proportion to the degree of American or Oriental environment that surrounds the individual.

The world is aware of the dominating part that loyalty plays in the life of the Japanese race. Though loyalty is a factor also in the background of the European immigrant, the Japanese variety of loyalty is of a kind and intensity that is unique in modern history. With the abolition of feudalism in 1868 and the restoration of the Emperor, the thirty million commoners of the nation transferred their clan loyalties from their feudal chieftains and concentrated them upon the person of their Sovereign. This rallying to the Emperor

brought about the unification of the country and has made possible Japan's remarkable modern development. The Japanese immigrant brings to the new country this inherited instinct of loyalty as he brings his own soul. The passage of time does not dim the devotion which unites him and his race in the ties of a great family with their supreme ruler as Father. A tragedy in the lives of the Japanese of the older generation in America is that their children do not inherit this instinct of loyalty to the Japanese Throne. To thousands of the rising generation of American-born Japanese the Emperor means nothing. To them history means American history and loyalty is the loyalty that they feel to the American Government. Added to this cleavage is the language barrier between parents and children, for as the latter go out into American schools and society they increasingly think and speak in English and the language of their ancestors is forgotten.

An interesting contrast between the Chinese and Japanese communities in America is that whereas the Japanese have made the attempt to conform to American standards and to break with much of their background, the Chinese have reproduced their background and have surrounded themselves with the atmosphere and coloring of China. The streets, shops, commodities, and pastimes of the picturesque Chinatowns of the Pacific Coast cities are near replicas of the streets and shops of Canton and Foochow. The Chinese have transplanted their background more successfully than any other immigrant that has established himself on American soil. (In these colorful centers,) Chinese life moves

placidly on, functioning with its own social and political organizations, fighting its own battles, suffering its own tragedies, minding its own business, content with itself and unconcerned with the alien civilization which swirls around it like river eddies around an island.

This has been a possible course for the Chinese because the China that these older people represent has not accepted Western standards and is convinced that Chinese civilization is superior to all else in the world. This has placed the Chinese immigrant in an impregnable position. Not being under the necessity of conforming to and accepting Western culture, he has been able to ignore insults, ridicule or the occasional interruption of his gainful pursuits, and address his energies strictly to business and his own affairs. After escaping from competitive occupations the Chinese have found a quiet niche in American life and for many years have been enjoying increasing popularity.

The experience of the Japanese immigrant in America has been quite different. He comes from a nation that during the last half century has been changing many of its fundamental institutions in its struggle to qualify as a modern power on the basis of Western standards. This struggle of the nation has been reenacted in miniature by thousands of the Japanese argonauts who have steered Eastward. One looks in vain among the Japanese communities of the Pacific Slope for "little Tokyos" or reproductions of Osaka's theatre street. The universal urge has been to discard the old and conform to the new environment and in homes, commodities, dress and habits to Americanize as com-

pletely as circumstances would allow. The exceptions that are often quoted, such as language schools and newspapers and Buddhist temples are in such contrast to the general trend as to prove the rule.

This characteristic of the Japanese in America has rendered him sensitive to criticism, self-conscious and uncertain of himself, and has put him in a disadvantageous position with Americans as compared with the easy indifference of the Chinese. The consciousness of opposition and of the persistent attempts to limit his activities by legislation has developed in him a pessimism and a certain disillusionment with life. For years he has been living under a strain, maintaining a pose, like a man constantly balancing and never quite sure of his ground. Probably the bitterest element in the situation of the Japanese immigrant created by the American Exclusion Act is the realization that in spite of his unquestioned progress toward American standards and culture there remain certain racial backgrounds that he has carried with him from his own country that he has been unable to discard in a generation and which, though invisible to himself, form subtle barriers to acceptance by the American people on even terms with peoples of European inheritance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bertrand Russell, *The Problem of China*, 1922
Arthur H. Smith, *Chinese Characteristics*, 1892
Sidney H. Gulick, *Evolution of the Japanese*, 1905
I. Nitobé, *Bushido, the Soul of Japan*, 1907
Lafcadio Hearn, *Japan, an Attempt at Interpretation*, 1904
Albert W. Palmer, *The Human Side of Hawaii*, 1924

CHAPTER XIII

THE POLES

By FLORIAN ZNANIECKI,

Professor of Sociology, University of Poznan; author of "Cultural Reality"; joint author with W. I. Thomas of "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America."

IN speaking of the Poles at the present stage of anthropological research, it seems best to eliminate entirely the concept of race and to avoid carefully any generalization presuming the existence of inherited characters common to all or to the majority of people of Polish nationality. I do not mean merely that one-third of the citizens of the Polish state belong to different ethnic groups (Jews, Ruthenians, Germans), but that the two-thirds which are ethnically Polish do not constitute one race, either in the sense of an anthropologically pure stock or in that of a homogeneous mixture. In historic times there has been a large and continuous stream of foreign immigration from the West, chiefly German, but presumably also Dutch. From the East have come war-prisoners and sometimes free settlers—Tartars, Wallachians, Hungarians. A certain proportion of Ruthenian and Lithuanian neighbors has been ethnically absorbed. And even in pre-historic times the population of the Polish territories seems to

have been far from homogeneous racially. Recent exact anthropological studies have revealed the existence of at least four somatically distinct racial types in the Polish population, and it will need many years before the proportionate distribution of these types can be determined. Whatever common features may be found among the Poles or among certain classes of Poles, must be ascribed to other than anthropological factors.

Among these, natural environment must be, of course, taken into account, though rather as a contributing than as a causally determining factor. Poland—like northeastern Germany and western Russia—is prevalently a plain, moderately fertile, and with a relatively uniform, temperate climate: it is thus a natural basis for a certain definite type of agriculture. Only the narrow mountainous range of the south, the rich mining corner in the southwest, and the short Baltic coast offer opportunities for different occupational pursuits. Agriculture has therefore played the chief part in determining the national character of the Poles. But the influence of agriculture can only indirectly be called an influence of the natural environment, for nature has been moulded by man to serve his needs. This is particularly evident in the case of Poland, whose territory was originally covered with forests and won to agriculture only gradually, step by step.

Thus the background of the Polish immigrant is predominantly determined by cultural factors. Some of these have shaped the character of the entire nation; others have influenced primarily certain elements of the nation. The most important of the former are: (1)

language and literature; (2) religion; (3) political conditions.

Language has been the most important factor of Polish national unity. Though there are a number of provincial dialects, the differences between them are much less marked than in Germany or Italy. The common language is a synthetic product of several dialects, rather than—as in France—the result of the predominance of one dialect. It originated in the needs of political life. Poland in the past was a half-republican state ruled by the nobility, or military class. The common political interests produced an early cultural unification of the politically active elements of the country. Even foreign groups, like the Ruthenian and Lithuanian ruling classes, by being incorporated into this political organization, became culturally assimilated and adopted the Polish language. From the beginning of the sixteenth century, Polish supplanted Latin as the literary language; and literature achieved the unification which politics had begun.

The Roman Catholic religion in the second common factor which has affected the great majority of Polish society. It was superimposed in the tenth century upon an apparently highly developed system of pagan beliefs and practices, many survivals of which still persist in isolated peasant communities, as elsewhere in Europe. The Church was in the Middle Ages the great civilizing power which brought Poland into the community of Western nations. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Hussitism, Calvinism, Lutheranism, and other Protestant doctrines penetrated into Poland; and there

was a moment when the country seemed on the verge of becoming Protestant. However, Catholicism prevailed in the end, owing chiefly to political reasons. During the last thirty years several new sects have sprung up; but they do not seem to prosper. Since religious innovation seems to depend upon the existence of strong mystical tendencies, and since the large mass of the Polish population—particularly in modern times—is more interested in the social than in the mystical aspect of religion, the Catholic Church with its powerful social organization, its imposing ceremonial, and its rich body of traditions will probably satisfy for a long time to come the religious aspirations of the majority of Poles. It is this social aspect of religion which emphatically predominates among the Polish immigrants in America, for whom the church is essentially a community center.

In the political field, the various classes of Polish society had little in common up to the end of the eighteenth century. The peasants were without rights; the town population had little influence—and, moreover, nearly 50 per cent of it was Jewish; the nobility was the only class politically active. In 1791 a new and more democratic constitution was promulgated, but two years later Poland fell. This very fall, however, by making all classes equally powerless, resulted in a gradual unification of Polish society on the ground of the common interest in recovering independence. During the World War and the Bolshevik invasion of 1920, the nation showed a marked solidarity, in spite of secondary party differences.

In America, this common political interest was the original source and remained—up to the end of the War, at least—the nominal reason of existence of nearly all the political organizations of Polish immigrants which were not merely an expression of the local interests of particular territorial groups. Such institutions as the Polish National Alliance, the Roman Catholic Union, the Sokols, etc., originated with the purpose of preparing to assist Poland in any future struggle for freedom. They actually did fulfill this purpose during the World War by helping to collect money and to organize troops of volunteers. Since then, however, these political organizations serve almost exclusively the interests of the American Poles.

Thus, the chief significance of the three general cultural factors enumerated above is not so much that they have prevented any individual immigrant from adapting himself personally to American society, as that they have caused the Polish immigrants as a group to isolate themselves from American society. Somewhat different is the rôle of those factors that we are now about to discuss and that are common only to those classes of Polish society from which the immigrants are recruited.

The Polish class system in the past contained two distinct hierarchies. The country population was divided by a sharp line into nobility and peasants. The former ranged from magnates equalling in power and wealth many a ruling prince of Germany or Italy, and interallied with the Bourbons, Hapsburgs and Hohenzollerns, down to large and impoverished families,

which after multiplying and subdividing their lands through centuries lived on homesteads of a few acres each and were distinguished only by traditional and political rights from the peasants. The latter were divided into small farmers and landless servants, both serfs. The population of the towns, much less numerous, ranged from well-to-do merchants and house-owners through the craftsman class down to unskilled laborers.

In the nineteenth century the liberation of serfs and the development of industry modified this system. Differences of rights decreased until the last remnants were abolished by the new Polish Republic. A mere vestige of the old aristocratic distinctions survives in the sentimental claim to social superiority conferred by noble birth, and comparable in America to arrival on the *Mayflower*. The really important distinctions are those of occupation and wealth. The difference between country and town remains essentially an occupational one; it is rather fluid, for there is a continuous migration of country laborers to cities and industrial centres, while many enriched city inhabitants buy land in the country.

The country population contains now three main classes: the large estate-owners, possessing from 400 to 100,000 acres, who do no manual work, but manage personally their property; small landowners possessing farms of from 3 to 400 acres, working physically with or without hired help; and landless country proletariat, living in families as laborers on large estates or hiring themselves individually to estate-owners and smaller farmers. The town population includes four classes:

wealthy bourgeoisie who own the big shops and factories, employ hired labor, and do no manual work; small traders, shop-keepers, and independent craftsmen, who work in their own enterprises with or without assistance; the city proletariat—factory and shop workers, journeymen, unskilled laborers, etc.; and finally, the intellectual class, including all the brain workers, scientists, artists, teachers, members of the free professions, engineers with university training, state and office employees, etc. In general, brain work ranks in Poland socially higher, and physical work socially lower, than in America. Except for this and for the sentimental vestige of old aristocracy mentioned above, there is no important difference between the Polish and the American class system, since there is no obstacle to passing from one class to another and all adults including women have full political rights.

Now, America has been receiving almost exclusively immigrants from the lower country and town classes, proletariat, small farmers, shop-keepers. No members of the well-to-do classes and few intellectuals emigrate, for their position is relatively better in Poland; whereas for the penniless physical worker opportunities in America are much greater. In order to understand all that America means to the Polish peasant or city worker one must realize not only the small scale of their incomes, but also the slow pace of economic advance when the latter is possible at all. The income of a farmer on 15 acres, of an agricultural laborer with one or two children of working age, or of a factory worker amounts to about \$200—\$300 a year. The independent

baker or blacksmith in a small town with a shop of his own and one assistant, or a skilled workman in a factory can make perhaps \$400—\$500 a year. Single domestic servants get \$40—\$80 a year besides their living. Though a dollar in Poland is worth as much as two in America, still this is little above the bare necessities of life. The individual cannot hope to improve much his own situation, and only by a great effort is he able to prepare a better future for his children. In the abnormal conditions created by the War and its immediate economic and political consequences a number of persons of the lower classes have indeed risen rapidly to fortunes and important positions, while many well-to-do families have been ruined; but in normal times such rapid changes are rare.

America has always meant, thus, for the poorer classes of Polish society the possibility of accelerating the pace of economic advance with no other means than hard physical labor and thrift. It must be kept in mind that very few Polish immigrants before the War came to America with the intention of remaining permanently. Their plan was to return home after some years and with the help of their savings to settle on a higher economic and social level than before. America was the land of great opportunities for advancing in the old country. Therefore, the standard of living of the new immigrant was intentionally kept as low as possible, sometimes even lower than at home. The fact that about 60 per cent of those who came with such purposes never went back shows how easy must have been their subjective adaptation to their new milieu. Since immi-

gration has been restricted, nearly all of the immigrants who come mean to stay permanently with their relations.

This facility of adaptation to American conditions can only be understood when we know the social equipment the immigrant brings with him and see how this equipment conditions his life organization in the new country. This equipment in the majority of cases is originally the traditional social system and social psychology of the peasant, for not only are the poorer country classes three times as numerous as the corresponding classes in towns (Poland has 68 per cent country population, and of the 32 per cent town inhabitants one-third are Jews), but the town population is in a large measure of peasant origin and has the same traditions as the peasant, only modified and weakened by city life.

What fundamentally determines the social life of the peasant is that he is a member of a system of permanent primary groups, *i.e.*, groups every member of which knows personally every other member, or at least knows about him. This system includes: (1) the large family—relatives on the paternal and maternal sides, usually up to the third degree, with their wives and husbands—of which the small family (husband, wife, and children) are only a part; (2) the territorial community or neighborhood, including first one's own village or hamlet as the nearest group and secondly the country around as far as personal acquaintance can reach, this wider neighborhood usually centering around the nearest market town; (3) the religious community

or parish, centering around the church and containing a number of religious and, lately, economic associations under the leadership of the priest; (4) the political community or commune, which sometimes coincides with the village, but oftener includes a number of villages and hamlets, and is an administrative unit presided over by an elective mayor and council; usually it contains also economic institutions, *e.g.*, communal bank, or agricultural circle, and an educational organization (school board).

As far as this system still remains vital, the individual is under the continuous social control of all these groups, more particularly of the large family. The family is controlled by the opinion of the village and the parish. The latter are subject to neighborhood influences, whereas the commune acts as intermediary between the individual and the family on the one side and the state on the other side. This primary social milieu, by working upon the original social tendencies of the individual—his desires for communication, emotional response, coöperation, recognition, mastery, subordination—imposes upon him the traditional ideals of personal conduct, and by a set of customs and mores regulates his relations with other people, his work, his play, his thoughts and emotions. At the same time, it gives adequate satisfaction to his social need by making him feel a full and active member of a society which, though narrow when measured by the standards of modern cultural demands, is nevertheless wide enough for his mental horizon. Though the isolation of peasant communities has been gradually breaking up in the course

of the last two generations and particularly since the outbreak of the War, and though the peasant has been slowly drawn into active participation in national life, he still remains essentially a primary-group man. His interest in institutions and problems which cannot be reduced to personal contact is rather vague; he easily loses his social and moral bearing when separated from his original milieu and put into unfamiliar surroundings.

The usages and mores of old town life have disappeared almost completely; and the poorer classes in Polish towns and industrial centers are much less influenced by tradition than the peasants. They also show less social cohesion. The large family has become disintegrated, and even the small family shows signs of decadence. The place of the village and the neighborhood is taken by a relatively loose and narrow circle of family friends and acquaintances. The commune and even the parish have very little social importance. Furthermore, there is an important disorganizing factor in the ways of spending leisure time. In the country the problem of leisure is solved by various kinds of social gatherings and entertainments: evening calls on relatives and village neighbors, Sunday meetings in and around the church and the inn, dances, neighborhood functions, the town market and the fair, christenings, weddings and funerals. These gatherings are means of keeping the individual under the control of the normal social milieu and of making him participate in its life. In the town, some of these—neighborhood calls and family celebrations—are still kept up. But in most cases leisure time is spent away from those regular in-

fluences which keep the individual socially normal. In the public tavern, dancing hall, movie theater, the individual meets persons who do not belong to his usual milieu and thus emancipates himself from the control of all stable social groups. Thus, town life represents a great weakening of social pressure and is consequently dangerous for individuals accustomed to such close community of interests as the peasant and the country laborer. Demoralization inevitably sets in and gradually reacts upon the villages, undermining their old social features.

On the other hand, the city offers new objective interests and stimulations, and opens to the worker new social circles: the shop and the factory exercise a great influence, which unhappily has not yet been studied; political life, cramped before the War by the restrictions of the ruling powers, has greatly developed since; the coöperative movement, which received a strong check during the War and the subsequent economic crisis, is again rapidly growing. The Sociological Institute of Poznan recently collected nearly two hundred autobiographies of workmen. In reading them, I was surprised to discover the powerful constructive possibilities which are implied in these new interests and social circles. Many city-born individuals whose family and early neighborhood seemed to predestine them to a criminal career have developed into socially useful and even superior personalities by taking advantage of these possibilities in later youth. The ability to resist detrimental influences and to utilize beneficent ones seems ultimately to depend upon the in-born endowment of

the individual, and a study of these autobiographies leaves one with a sincere respect for the in-born endowment of the Polish workman.

However, it is mainly the background of the peasant majority which has conditioned the social organization of the Poles in America. The immigrants have tried to reconstruct as far as they could the concrete primary social system of the old country by settling in compact masses and organizing territorial communities. Since the old traditional groups could obviously not be transferred to the new country—except, sometimes, the small family—some substitutions had to be created to keep up the social cohesion. Such substitutes are: first of all, the Polish-American parish, which is not a mere copy of the old Polish parish, but a combination of parish, village and commune; and secondly, the innumerable associations which are found in every community for mutual help or common amusement, for the control of the parish, the education of the young, and economic cooperation. The secondary-group organization for political purposes, of which we have spoken above, has been superimposed upon this territorial organization under the influence of the few Polish intellectuals who have migrated to America, and is much less vital for the immigrant than his primary-group community.

Thus, the immigrant who comes to a Polish-American colony easily makes himself at home there. Of course, his work in an American factory is entirely new to him; he earns more, can have better lodgings, more modern clothes, more varied amusements; and the entire pulse

of life is much quicker, more intense. Socially, he is more independent of his community than the peasant, though less so than the workman in a Polish city. He is free not to join his community; but if he does not do so, he has no way of satisfying his powerful social tendencies, since he is practically debarred from close contact with Americans. Some influences from the spiritual culture of America reach him indirectly through the press and through the half-Americanized younger generation. But with all this, the essential fact remains that his milieu is still in the main a primary society, where nearly all of his social interests are centered and where he is much more effectually isolated from wider social interest and higher intellectual life than the workman in a Polish city.

On the other hand, an immigrant who has lived for years in one of these Polish-American communities and then goes to Poland—as many of them have done since the War—has much trouble in adapting himself to Polish society. If he is satisfied to take up his old place as peasant or small village trader he often proves a useful and successful addition to his community. But if, as generally happens, he aspires to play an important rôle in middle class society, corresponding more or less to that which he has played in Polish-American society, he finds almost as much difficulty in controlling the new and more complex conditions as he would have found in America, had real access to American society been open to him. Whereas intellectuals who received their education either in Europe or in America—even those

of foreign nationality, like the Anglo-Saxon or Irish social workers and business men who went to Poland during the War and remained there—have easily fitted into the existing scheme of things.

Such facts suggest that the important problem is not change from one national culture to another, but from one cultural level to another. The returned Polish peasant is in much the same situation as a Tartra mountaineer or a Volhynian peasant who moves to Warsaw, or a Breton sailor or vine-cultivator of Beaume who goes to live in Paris. When such a peasant migrates to a foreign country, his troubles are further increased by the need of learning a new language. But the cultural life of all Western nations has so much in common that, the handicap of language having once been overcome, the problem of adaptation to a different national milieu is relatively easy as compared with the problem of passing from a primary to a secondary group milieu, from a country or a small town community to the system of any complex modern society.

Now, America has less primary-group life than Europe, and the Polish immigrant seldom finds access to it. If he does—as in the case of agricultural settlers—there is hardly any problem of adaptation to the American milieu. Usually, however, he comes to a city, having never lived in a large city before; and is, moreover, confused by not understanding the language. As there is no institution or group like those in his own land to introduce him into the life of the city as active participant, he falls into Polish-American society and

remains there—a problem for both Poland and America.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, 1920
Emily Greene Balch, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*, 1910

CHAPTER XIV

RUSSIANS AND BALTIC PEOPLES

By ARTHUR RUHL,

Journalist; author of "New Masters of the Baltic."

RUSSIANS of the simpler sort pull up stakes and wander rather easily in their own country. And this drifting habit varies from the out-and-out nomadry of some of the tribes which inhabit the southeastern steppes to the mere seasonal change of work common among the peasants of the Volga provinces.

The latter, at least the men peasants, have long been accustomed to go to the towns in winter, to work in factories, to drive cabs, or pick up what odd jobs they may. The characteristic "isvoschik," or cab-driver, of Leningrad or Moscow, has little about him of the cockney. Beneath his padded blue overcoat and queer little bell-crowned stiff hat, he is a farmer at heart, with the Russian peasant's fog-horn voice, his slow, easy-going ways and the habit of crossing himself whenever he sees a church. So many men peasants thus leave their lands during part of the year, that the Russian censuses sometimes show from 15 to 35 per cent more women than men in the essentially farming provinces while roundabout the larger cities there may be a similar disproportion of men.

In some of the poorer provinces, where the margin

between "normal" existence and starvation is painfully narrow, moving about is almost a habit of life. The peasant has so little in the way of animals, machinery and household furnishings, that when a bad season comes he often simply packs up and hits the trail for pastures new. The habit which Russian villages—with their wooden, straw-thatched cottages—have, of burning down periodically, has doubtless increased this wandering habit, and the equally periodical famines have been another cause. Russia's enormous expanse, its comparative lack of communications, its crude farming methods, have been among the causes which made famines of greater or less severity a more or less regular thing. During the great famine of '21-'22, hundreds of thousands of peasants threw what they could into a little basket-like peasant wagon, or packed up what flour, grain, salt, blankets and pans they could carry on their backs, and simply fled into the blue. But what happened then, on a staggering and nation-wide scale, has frequently happened in a smaller way, in this Russian neighborhood or that.

If with these habits, comparatively few "regular" Russian peasants have emigrated to America, the explanation is not hard to find. Quite apart from any questions of temperament or initiative, or even of money and distance, they had no need to go abroad when they had their own frontier and their own "wild west" at home. The vast stretches of Siberia were always waiting, with cheap land and horses and plenty of space, and to trek eastward there was no need of steamship tickets.

These remarks apply more particularly to the "regular" Russians of European Russia, the peasants described in the stories of Russian life with which Americans are familiar. Of course, if one attempts to generalize about the whole of that sprawling empire that used to be ruled by the Tsar—something like one-seventh of the land surface of the earth—one would have to take into consideration the habits of nearly half a hundred races or tribes.

Of the 150,000,000 Russians of one sort and another, somewhat less than half, are, strictly speaking, Slavs. Of these the so-called Great Russians, who, for centuries, have centered about Moscow, make by far the largest part. The Little Russians, or Ukrainians, who live in the southern part of European Russia, from the general latitude of Kiev down to the Black Sea, come next. Whether, as the Ukrainian nationalists assert, Ukrainian is a language different from Russian, or, as the Great Russians always maintained, merely a Russian dialect, bearing somewhat the same relation to the language of Muscovy as Provençal French does to the French of Paris, need not be fought out here. The languages sound different, at any rate, and the Ukrainians often show a certain vivacity and "southern" dash which is less common among the peasantry of Great Russia.

The White Russians (the name has nothing to do with complexion) live on the central western border, and they and the Poles, or such part of them as war and revolution have left to Russia, complete the list of Russian Slavs.

The Lithuanians and Letts, whose present-day republics used to be northwestern Russian provinces, are not Slavs, but they do fall in the Aryan group of peoples, as do Russia's citizens of Rumanian and Greek, German and Swede, Armenian and Kurdish origin.

Of the non-Aryans, the Jews come first, so far as American immigration is concerned. Having no country of their own, Jewish immigrants come to the United States as citizens of the countries in which they have lived, and are set down as "Russians," "Poles," "Germans" or what not.

The third great group of Russians is the so-called Ural-Altaic, and includes the Finns and Esthonians (both Esthonia and Finland being now independent republics); the Turko-Tartar branch, with its Turks, Tartars, Turkomans, Chuvash, Kirghese, Baskhirs and others; and the Mongol branch of Kalmucks and Buriats. Then there is a fourth "Caucasian" group of Georgians and Circassians. It will be plain, even from this sketchy picture of the Russian human map, that the subject is complex, and that "if you scratch a Russian," you will not only, as the old saying has it, "find a Tartar," but goodness knows what!

Naturally enough, the word "Russian" is applied in our country to immigrants who may differ from each other quite as much as we—whoever "we" may be!—differ from Germans or Swedes or Frenchmen. In our big cities, the "Russian" is often a Jew, although he was once a Russian subject and speaks Russian. When the Moscow Art Theatre visited New York, for instance, the "Russians" who crowded the balcony and gallery

and kept the venture going, were mostly Jews from the lower East Side.

When some Middle-western manufacturer, trying to get a letter or circular translated into Russian, finds his "Russians" at last, through the aid of some local settlement house, they very likely will turn out to be Lithuanians, who were formerly Russian citizens and speak the language, but are proud of their own language (which has no resemblance to Russian) and enthusiastic partisans of the new Lithuanian republic.

Finland, again, was a Russian Grand Duchy before the War, and its inhabitants Russian citizens. Educated Finns spoke Russian as a matter of course, but with their "western" training and point of view (through their former connection with Sweden) they looked down on the Slav Russians with just as much enthusiasm as the average upper-class Russian emigré, for instance, looks down on the average Finnish chamber-maid or farm-hand.

So far as American immigration is concerned, most of the many Russian races and tribes may, of course, be left out of account. The Khirghese horsemen who trade back and forth between Siberia and southeastern Russia in the cheap Siberian horses, might, for example, soon find themselves quite at home on a Western American cattle-ranch. But they are simple semi-nomads, and no more think of emigrating to America than would so many Esquimos. The same with most of the other half-Asiatic Russians. The only Russians who have played any considerable part in American immigration

are those from Great Russia and the Ukraine, and from the western tier of border provinces.

If one were to attempt to generalize about these argonauts, I suppose it would be safe to say, especially of the "regular," central plain Russians, that they are, as immigrants go, a bit shy and lonesome in our western world. They do not have, like the Irish, powerful friends—Mayors, district bosses, policemen, contractors and so on—among their own people. Their predecessors have not, like the Italians, already become a force in the land. They have no great churches, few restaurants and cafes. They cannot step, as the Scandinavians can, into communities, where all the names over the shop doors are Swedish or Norwegian, and where people from their own neighborhoods in the old country have already become the owners of factories and members of the local school board.

They do not take very readily to American hustle and push. The "regular" Russian is a bit lazy and easy-going. He is more interested, in his natural state, in having a good time in a simple way than in "getting ahead." When his work is over, he likes to loaf about, drinking vodka or endless glasses of tea, playing the concertina, perhaps, singing or dancing. He is likely to think the other immigrants with whom he is thrown in America as a bit too slick and smart-alecky, just as they, with their greater adaptability for climbing on the Yankee bandwagon, are likely to consider him something of a "boob." This is not so true of the immigrants from the western border provinces as of what

are called here the "regular" Russians, and of the Jews it is often not true at all. But in general, it might be said that nearly everybody born in humble station east of Memel is likely to have something of that "broad," easy-going Russian nature, and a certain bear-like clumsiness amidst western city ways.

Before considering the different classes of Russian immigrants separately, and by way of establishing a certain norm, so to say, it might be worth while to glance at the sort of life these "regular" Russian peasants lead—at one of those sprawling little brown patches of thatched roof, with their clusters of onion-shaped, gilt or sky-blue church domes, which begin as soon as you cross the border from East Prussia and dot the level landscape for many 'days' journey eastward.

The village straggles along the main road, which is not a made road, generally, but simply a more or less well-beaten trail across the prairie, dusty in dry weather and anywhere from ankle to hub deep when it rains. The two rows of houses are set well back from the wheel ruts, so that the wide stretch of turf between them makes almost a sort of elongated "square" in which geese and pigs may promenade and the children fly their kites. Russians like elbow-room, except when they pack themselves indoors in winter, and are accustomed to plenty of it.

In the north the cottages are of wood; the farther north, the bigger the logs; the farther south the less wood, until in the steppe country or the Ukraine, they are generally built of sun-dried bricks, or wicker framework plastered with clay. Inside there may be two or

three rooms or even only one, generally with a dirt floor. A home-made brick stove serves for cooking and heating, and on top of, or at the side of the stove, is a brick platform on which, in cold weather, most of the family sleep. The phrase "sleeping on the stove" often amuses Americans, but it is not so odd as it sounds—no hotter or more uncomfortable than it would be, for instance, to sleep on a platform built above the average cellar furnace. And with forty degrees Fahrenheit outside, and no fuel to spare, as is often the case, people are glad enough to save what heat they may.

Nobody bothers much about ventilation or fresh air. Russians seem to get along just as well without it. Anyone who has lived through a winter in a log house in our own northern woods will understand how the thirst for fresh air varies with one's distance from a steam-heated flat.

Food and clothing are of the simplest. In the summer, the men wear a loose belted shirt or blouse, which falls outside their breeches and serves both as shirt and coat. In winter, they bundle up in sheep-skins, the leather outside, the wool turned in. Boots are rather a luxury. In summer both men and women often go barefoot. The commonest foot-covering is a bast sandal, often stuffed with straw. Homespun is still found, and before the Revolution, at least, there used to be a good deal of attractive peasant embroidery. Different provinces, or "governments," as they say in Russia, have different characteristic costumes, and the women's waists, in particular, are often lively with red or dark blue embroidery, in which sometimes geometric figures

are used, sometimes quaintly conventionalized ducks or turkeys.

Meat is a luxury, and grain the staff of life, either in the form of coarse rye bread, baked into huge circular flat loaves, or of a sort of porridge called *kasha*. Sour milk and cream, in various forms, are staples. The sour milk crock is sometimes kept going very much as American housewives keep buckwheat cake batter going through the winter. As the clabber is taken out, new milk is poured in, which thickens in its turn. Cabbage, in the shape of cabbage-soup and also a sort of sauerkraut, is another staple. In general, the Russians are huge eaters, making up in bulk what they lack in concentration. The peasant drinks vodka when he can get it, and consumes enormous quantities of weak tea. In every Russian railroad station there is a place where one may obtain free hot water. The simpler people take their kettles with them when travelling as a matter of course. While the train is making one of its leisurely pauses they tumble out, gallop to the *kipiatok* or hot-water tank, come back with a kettleful, and then, with a pinch of tea, a loaf of bread, and an onion or a bit of dried fish, they needn't bother about dining-cars. Another beverage is *kvass*, a drink made out of fermented bread and water, which tastes a little like cider.

Machinery is scarce. Since the Revolution there has been a great deal of talk about tractors and other modern farm implements in Russia, but except on the larger estates, the Russians of the pre-Revolutionary days, were still, so far as farm machinery went, almost in the 18th century. Plows are often homemade affairs which

do little more than scratch the ground. Partly this is a matter of farming custom, but partly also, it has the practical reason behind it that the plow must not cut so deep that it cannot be dragged by one of the scrubby little peasant horses, by a horse and cow yoked together, or even, in extreme cases, by two husky women.

The fields, generally in strips or scattered patches, lie outside the villages, sometimes miles away from the hut of the family which works them. Russians take naturally to communal life. The English my-house-is-my-castle instinct, never seems to have been strong in them. The large estates were walled away by forests and fences, but Russian peasants have been accustomed to huddle together in villages no matter how much land there was, and then to troop out to their fields. More characteristic of Russians is the notion that the land belongs to those who work it, with the corollary that the workable land shall be reapportioned from time to time among the actual workers so that all shall share alike.

Men and women work together, quite naturally and as a matter of course. The little girls tend geese as soon as they are able to toddle about. And the buxom young peasant women can hold their own in the hay field or harvest with any man. There is something very cheerful and friendly about a Russian harvest scene, with the men swinging scythes in the old-fashioned way, the girls gathering and binding the grain, the whole happy family snoozing under the haystacks at noon or coming back at sundown, singing, through the fields.

Since the Revolution, movies and lecturers of various

sorts have begun to penetrate the Russian countryside. And in addition to these visitors, whose purpose is largely propaganda of one sort or another, reading-rooms and communist clubs have frequently been established. Formerly, the church, with its incense and chants, its ikons to kiss and saints' pictures to bow before, its mystery and healing power, was almost the only thing the peasant had—except vodka—to take him away from his everyday world.

Much has been written of Russian mysticism and religious devotion, some of it sensible and some not. Without going into a somewhat complex question here, it may at least be said that Russians are likely to be superstitious, and that the simpler sort make much of the external forms of their religion, believe in signs and portents, and in general behave toward the Eastern Church as the more primitive sorts of Westerners—South American *peons*, for example—behave toward the Roman Church. The Russian priests marry like anybody else. They exert little spiritual leadership, as a rule, sometimes drink more than is good for them, but they are generally kindly and "human," and held in respect as the keepers and interpreters of mysteries which the peasant is not expected to understand.

Sports, as such, except hunting, fishing, dancing, swimming and singing, are almost unknown. Russians love music, have a natural sense of rhythm, and will dance till the cows come home. They have no organs in their churches, but only human voices, and yet these voices blend with and support one another so perfectly that the lack of an accompaniment is never noticed.

Dancing, with them, is not merely a social amusement, in which men and women come together, but an athletic amusement, and men get as much fun out of showing their skill by themselves or in company with another man as they do in dancing with the girls. There is skating in winter, for those who have time and skates, and swimming for pretty much everybody in summer. Few things are more cheerfully "Russian" than the easy-going way the simpler sort of Russians have of slipping out of their clothes and into the water, wherever they happen to find a good place to swim. Nobody bothers about bathing suits—they simply wade in, like hot or thirsty cattle. The men generally make one herd, and the women another, a little way down the stream, but if the two herds get mixed occasionally on the edges, nobody bothers about that, either.

Most things about the peasant house are home-made or made by simple smiths or carpenters. Grain is still largely beaten out by flails, on some cleanly swept bit of ground near the house, and when the grain is beaten out, the women sift it through hand sieves held over their heads. In short, without going into further detail, it will be seen that here are people living very much as people lived in Biblical times, or as English peasants may have lived in Shakespeare's time or before. When Shakespeare made his Roman mob in "Julius Caesar" throw "their lousy caps in air" he was, of course, merely reflecting the manners of the lower classes of his day. Russian peasants also take lice and similar insects more or less as a matter of course. "A house ought to smell as if somebody lived in it," one of Turgenev's peasants

said. And there is even sometimes the feeling that there must be something a bit the matter with the man whom insects keep away from. After all, as Carlyle said of the *sans culottes*, "they, too, come from God!"

So much for the "regular" Russian peasant of the central plain. The picture has, of course, its variations. On the big estates there used to be machinery, organization, a certain reflection of the owner's more sophisticated life. Clever boys became coachmen and house servants, clever girls, ladies' maids and companions. There were—and are—rich peasants, *kulaks* or fists, as they are called, who have got together some capital, lend money to the less fortunate, and live more after the fashion of our own prairie farmers. The Ukrainian peasants are generally somewhat cleaner and neater than their Great Russian cousins, their houses more tastefully made, their whole temperament more animated. And of course what has been said of the "regular" Russians applies only slightly to the Russian Jews, who often come from cities of some size, are rarely farmers in a thoroughgoing sense of the word, and live a religious and social life of their own.

The Doukbors, who fall in with the "regular" Russians, geographically speaking, are in a class by themselves because of their religion. They are peasant non-conformists, with a belief suggesting that of the Quakers. They care nothing for the outward forms of religion, believe that the divine spirit is in all of us in greater or less degree, and that there is always a "church" when two or three are gathered together. They are pacifists, refuse military service, and hence

came in for persecution from the old Tsaristic government. Tolstoy came to their defense and interested various foreigners in their case, with the result that a good many emigrated both to Canada and this country.

The Russian Poles partake of the characteristics of the "regular" Russians—to the ordinary tourist, Russian Poland was indistinguishable from the rest of nearby Russia—but they are generally Roman Catholics instead of Russian "Orthodox."

The Lithuanians, who have been modified both by their association with Poland and Russia, although they are a race by themselves, are also likely to be Roman Catholic. They are proud of their long, straight noses, of their language which they say is more nearly like Sanskrit than any other modern language, and many of those who came to America a generation or so ago, took readily to our culture and ways and succeeded as business and professional men. When Lithuania declared her independence with the rest of the Baltic States, following the War and the Russian Revolution, it was largely the returned Lithuanian-Americans who served as the Ministers and diplomats of the new republic. In Kovno, in those days, one found plenty of Lithuanians who talked American, even to its latest slang, and who spoke in one breath of "these people" as if they, themselves, were "regular" Americans, and in the next—especially when the subject of Poland came up—were violent nationalists. The same is true, to a somewhat lesser extent of the Letts.

Both Latvia (the new Lettish republic) and Esthonia—the two made the former Russian provinces of Es-

thonia, Livonia and Courland—have a more or less Germanic air because of the fact that their people of consequence, even under Russian rule, were the so-called Balts—*i.e.*, Germanic descendants of the old Teutonic Knights who conquered these regions in the Middle Ages. Both Esthonians and Letts were serfs of the Balts until the beginning of the last century, the Balts owned the great estates until the Bolshevik revolution, and German was spoken in the shops of Reval and Riga more than either Russian or the speech of the lower-class majority.

Thanks to the thrifty example and teachings of the Balt land-owners, and the fact that the Lettish and Esthonian serfs were freed half a century before their Russian Slav neighbors, the present-day Esthonians and Letts are more literate than the Great Russian peasants, and in general more “western.” They are Lutheran Protestants, generally. They fought the Russian Bolsheviks during the early days of the Revolution, in order to keep their little countries under their own rule, but internally, in their treatment of the former land-owners, they have gone almost as far as the Bolsheviks themselves. Both Esthonians and Letts are somewhat more hard headed than their Great Russian neighbors.

What has been said of the Letts and Esthonians, applies to an even greater degree to the Finns, who live just across the Gulf. Racially, they are akin to the Esthonians, but Finland’s long experience under Swedish rule, and the fact that until Finland declared her independence, the Swedish-Finns—who spoke Swedish and took their culture from Sweden—were the people

of consequence in the tight little land of lakes and pine forests, made Finland, humanly-speaking, more like a part of Scandinavia, even when it was Russian Grand Duchy.

Nowadays, there is a strong and persistent movement toward a Finland for the Finns—toward crowding out the Swedish language and the Finns of Swedish inheritance as the Russians have already been crowded out. The “regular” Finns, those that is to say, who speak Finnish and are proud of their Finnish inheritance, were so thoroughly westernized before their national movement began to overwhelm the Swedish minority, that for all practical purposes from an American point of view, they may be regarded as Scandinavians. They are a stubborn, hard-headed people, Lutheran Protestant in religion, and accustomed to work hard, say little, and save their pennies.

The Russian emigrés who have come to America since the Bolshevik Revolution, do not represent, of course, what could be called normal immigration. Had history turned out differently, they would never have left their own country, and if chance ever offers, many of them, doubtless, will return to Russia again. A few professors have found places in our universities, and here and there former upper-class Russians have won a foothold in industry or business. Their numbers are too small to make their influence apparent, but in so far as it is exerted, their qualities of artistic sensitiveness, spiritual enthusiasm, and instinctive resistance to some of the standardizing influences of our civilization, ought to make them interesting and valuable.

There is one quality about Russia and Russians which impresses nearly all westerners who have visited the country—a certain vitality and reserve power. If some of the old upper-class were “over-civilized” in the sense that they had developed refinements at the expense of essentials, the bulk of the people were in just the other case. They might seem rough, crude, dirty, superstitious, lazy, or what you will. At any rate they were not, as a people, tired or “finished.” Their greatest days were still ahead.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arthur Ruhl, *New Masters of the Baltic*, 1921

Ralph Butler, *New Eastern Europe*, 1919

Harold Williams, *Russia of the Russians*, 1914

CHAPTER XV

THE SCANDINAVIANS

By HENRY GODDARD LEACH,

Editor of the Forum; President of the American-Scandinavian Foundation; holder of Swedish Decoration of Commander of the North Star; author of Scandinavia of the Scandinavians.

A PRONOUNCED bias in favor of the Nordic is frankly admitted in this chapter, although it willingly concedes more warmth and imagination to other European immigrant strains. And from the far-flung Nordic family of long skulls and blue eyes it will pick the Scandinavian group, the pure "High Nordics," and claim for them the highest average enlightenment, the most scientifically coördinated personalities, and best adjusted social relationships of any existing racial units.

The homely praise which William Penn gave the Swedes whom he found settled on the Delaware before the coming of the Quakers can be applied to our Scandinavian citizens today: "They have fine children," said Penn, "and almost every house is full; rare to find one of them without three or four boys and as many girls; some six, seven, and eight sons. And I must do them right—I see few young men more able and industrious."

More significant than this earlier colonization is the Scandinavian immigration that began with the landing

of a sloop-load of Norwegian Quakers in 1825. The inrolling tidal wave that brought us, among other new units, our Scandinavian population in the nineteenth century filled out the register until now three million of our people—one-fourth as many as the combined population of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden—are of Scandinavian parentage. The total Scandinavian immigration from 1820 to 1912 was around 2,200,000. They came in the general proportion of four Swedes to two Norwegians and one Dane. This estimate does not give sufficient numerical credit to the Norwegians; no European country except Ireland has lost a larger proportion of its population to America than has Norway. These High Nordics have settled in nearly every section of the northern United States, though not largely in the South; many of them crowding into our cities, but more of them ploughing up our farm lands. They have pioneered in building five Commonwealths—Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and North Dakota—and more recently in cutting the timber and developing the sea-faring life of the Pacific Coast.

How do these, our Scandinavian citizens, differ from the Anglo-Saxon stock, and how do they differ among themselves? In appearance they are very like the British, but inclined to be a trifle taller and with complexions more prevailingly blond. Both peoples have a blend of sweet reasonableness in common, and both are coöperationist, although in the Scandinavian the "I-am-my-brother's-keeper" impulse is not so emphatic as in the Briton and his American cousin. Of all racial groups they are the easiest stock for the Anglo-Saxon

race in America to assimilate. A glance at the racial history of our British antecedents will show a preponderant Scandinavian strain, due to the three successive waves of Scandinavian immigration in England; the Jutes and the Angles in the fifth century; the Danish and Norwegian vikings who resettled half of England in the ninth century; the Gallicized Danes and Norwegians who took over the feudal castles and the seats of government after the Norman Conquest in the eleventh century. In considering our Scandinavian immigrants, therefore, we are but studying a reenforcement of our earlier Nordic background.

Unlike some immigrant peoples, the Scandinavian accentuates rather than dilutes the pristine Yankee-Puritan virtues. As a farmer in the Middle-West he is inclined to become even more strict in his religion than the Puritan, and yet not wholly that, for he adds a little color to our austerity, an element of doubt and brooding to our naïve fundamentalist grasp on the principles of the universe. His contribution may be symbolized by the huge Minnesota barn that is painted red, whereas the typical New England farm-house is an unassailable white.

The Icelanders and Swedish Finns may claim that we should here consider five instead of three Scandinavian divisions, but the two smaller units may be omitted from so brief a study. Of the three larger groups, the contributions of the Norwegians to America have been most distinguished in the field of politics; those of the Swedes in our engineering and technical wonders; while the Danes have been quiet and exacting leaders in the pro-

fessions. At home in Norway, the century of immigration has been a century of political experiment; and somewhat of that acute interest in public life has been reflected among her sons over here. True the Irish have been ahead of them in politics, for they flocked at once to the cities, whereas the Norwegians had first to plough in the wilderness and take root. But now our Norwegians, too, have arrived politically and with their well-seasoned background bid fair to dispute the reins of government with our Irish masters. No less than twenty-one men of Scandinavian extraction sat in a recent United States Congress, six in the Senate and fifteen in the House. Seven governors of Minnesota have been of Scandinavian parentage.

In answer to the above eulogy, however, no challenge of "exclusive Nordic fanaticism" need be flung. Intelligent Iceland is a shining example of a segregated Nordic race, but admittedly it is too small a unit to pin a racial theory upon. The most successful civilizations on the grand scale—Greece, Rome, Spain, Britain—have resulted from the crossing of hardy races with more imaginative, and America and the Americans will be the better for a blend of Jewish, Slavic, and Mediterranean brains. Recently the writer collected a number of definitions of Americanism, and awarded a prize to the following composite racial formula:

"Define Americanism? Simple enough. Just find the common denominator for: George Washington, Washington Irving, Irving Berlin; Mary Garden, Mary Pickford, Mary Baker G. Eddy; Henry Ford, Henry Adams, O. Henry; Joseph Smith, Al Smith, Smith Brothers; Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roose-

velt, Woodrow Wilson; Stephen Wise, Jesse Lasky, Oscar Strauss; Judge Gary, Gene Debs, Babe Ruth; Jackie Coogan, Marion Talley, Red Grange; Jonathan Edwards, Billy Sunday, Harry Emerson Fosdick, and so forth."

A prize definition of Scandinavianism might be built upon a similar *mélange* of High Nordic names, names that affect the thinking processes and decisions of every Dane, Norwegian, or Swede in the home countries every day of his life. Here are a few samples of Danish heroes past and present, and the mental reminiscences that go with them: Valdemar the Victorious, the militant Danish monarch of the thirteenth century and his two beautiful wives, the one Portuguese, the other Bohemian, about whom ballads are still sung to-day in Danish nurseries; King Christian, flamboyant naval monarch of a later century, whose castles are now State Museums; Hans Christian Andersen, the shy, awkward Dane whose fairy tales delight little children of every clime; Hammershoi, painter of dust motes; Niels Bohr, in whose laboratory in Copenhagen the atom becomes a universe in miniature. The Danish mind runs to miniature and exquisite detail.

The Norwegian mind, by contrast, is more imaginative and grandiose. In Norway memory is crowded with the names of old Corsairs famous in Saga: Harald Fairhair, who united Norway; and King Haakon the Old, in the thirteenth century, recognized admiral of crusading Christendom; and in our day, the writers Ibsen, Björnson, and Hamsun; and the explorers Nansen and Amundsen.

The Swedish memory, again, cherishes steadfast har-

mony and poise. In Sweden yet another list of names helps to fashion the mental environment and mould the character of childhood. There is Gustav Vasa, who came out of Dalecarlia with his ski-runners to set Sweden free; Christian the Twelfth, by exception the popular "Mad Monarch," who showed Peter the Great how to defeat him and make room on Swedish territory for the city now known as Leningrad; in our time, the writers Selma Lagerlöf and August Strindberg, and the painters Zorn, Carl Larsson, Prince Eugen; a goodly line of explorers down to Prince William, and a distinguished succession of resolute scientists from Linnaeus to Svante Arrhenius. Firm in their Protestantism the nation of Gustavus Adolphus under the leadership of Nathan Söderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, called together the oecumenical congress of 1925.

Turning from the above kaleidoscope of heroic names that mould the mental judgments of the average adult Scandinavian, let us test the habits of an ideal Scandinavian family in Norway, or Sweden, or Denmark. A farmer's family will serve best for the purpose, a family say of six members, consisting of father, mother, two sons, and two daughters.

✓ One daughter on this ideal Scandinavian farm is still at home. Brita is a tall, flaxen-haired lass of sixteen who carries like a queen the typical long skull and generous brainpan that anthropologists have found in the High Nordic race. She speaks English with ease and can read French, German, and Latin at sight. She is adept about the house after school hours. She plays the violin, she weaves linen at the loom in one wing of

the barn. On Saturday and Sunday nights she swings gaily in complicated folk dances with song in the open-air dance pavilion of the neighboring village. She is not content with the health which comes to her easily in the open-air life of the farm; for at school she has been drilled in Swedish calisthenics and she belongs to a gymnastic class outside of the school and to a club cultivating special sports. She can perform creditably in several sports, but she is quite proficient in one; let us say it is jumping on skis. She has a definite National rating, as every alert young Swede has, in the National Athletic Association, according to the number of points she has scored in different contests.

If Brita does all this, the natural question to ask her is, "When do you sleep?" One practical answer is that she does, as a matter of fact, not sleep as much as the American girl. The foreign visitor to the North is astonished at the small amount of sleep which the average Scandinavian seems to require. A more subtle answer is that her time is very scientifically arranged and coördinated so that the program of the day moves along with a joyous rhythm which does not tend to produce weariness.

And Brita's thought of the future, At sixteen she probably does not expect to marry for another ten years. Meanwhile she wants to do many things, the anticipation of which stirs her imagination. It may be a few months in Paris, the reward of long savings, flirting with painting or music. It may be a year of practical domestic service in England.

As to marriage, Brita will enter into it with more of

candor and less of romance than some of her foreign cousins. The period of engagement may extend over several years of intimate acquaintance. She will make a pre-nuptial agreement as to property. If, after the ceremony, she and her husband are not able to adjust themselves to each other, they know that according to the Scandinavian marriage laws they may register their differences with the judge, live apart for one year, and establish a divorce.

Now as to Brita's older sister. She is away, finishing her education at a school of domestic science. Her two brothers are also at college. One, knowing that he is to inherit the ancestral farm, is finishing off with fellow-farmers at a folk high school, while the other brother has elected for himself a starched-collar life. He is up at the University in the midst of a long, seven-year course of study which will enable him to practice law. The fifth child, if there had been five children, would likely have emigrated to America, for the Scandinavian countries have never tolerated over-population. They have re-populated Europe with their best blood several times in history, and now that they are cut off from America by our recent Immigration Acts, they are more and more practising scientific birth control.

Brita's brother at college exhibits marked High Nordic characteristics. In his studies he is thoroughgoing, meticulous to a detail. He is as careful in memorizing the law as a Scandinavian needlewoman in making her lace. What he erects in his mind he expects to be permanent. He is intellectually direct and hence not open to propaganda; in fact, for more than a century the

Swedes and Norwegians have resisted all emotional propaganda to lead them into war with each other or any other nation, and there has been plenty of provocation. He is generous to extravagance, particularly to guests. He will mortgage his own future, for the sake of his family and friends. He is a stalwart individualist, sufficient unto himself.

This Scandinavian law student is also subject to certain destructive racial complexes, some apparently inherited, some clearly environmental—which exercise a check-rein and balance. For example, if he comes to America, that very thoroughness which gains him respect at home, brings upon him, among us, the charge of stupidity and unadaptability. Again, the struggle for existence in an old mountain or congested community and the loneliness that goes with intense individualism often set up those states of melancholy and grimness of determination which we associate with the plays of Ibsen and Strindberg. Self-analysis occasionally leads to suicide, which seems inconsistent with such a carefully ordered environment. Then, too, by our American standards this Scandinavian student is too proud, exhibiting what psychoanalysts now label “inferiority complex.”

The Swedes cherish a vice which they call “The Royal Swedish Jealousy.” This tight characteristic puts those addicted to it at a disadvantage in America where there is room for all. The Scandinavian student is said to be over jealous of students who excel him in studies he finds difficult; jealous of the man in public life who arrives at the top. This jealousy, when it is

translated to Scandinavians in America does not lead to violence, as it does with more volatile races, but often to backbiting and absurd personal prejudices.

The High Nordic peoples themselves seldom employ the word "Scandinavian." They call their common geographical realm "The North." As Danes, Norwegians, Swedes, Icelanders, and Swedish Finns, they recognize distinct temperamental differences. Swedes, Danes and Norwegians find that they get on better as separate political groups. They have learned to agree to differ without carrying their differences to a military arbitrament.

The different manner in which the three Northern peoples drink health before meat to their guests at table will, perhaps, serve to indicate some of the distinctions. The Scandinavian word for health is *skaal*, from the ancient custom whereby the victorious corsair drank the mead of hospitality out of the skull of his dead foe. In Norway it is a very fierce and solemn ceremony. The Norwegian raises his glass toward you and looks at you with a grim, set expression, with a furrow in his brow as he pronounces, almost gruffly, the word of greeting. Host and guest drink together. In Sweden the drinking of the toast is accompanied with all the ceremonious bows of the court of Louis the Fourteenth, French manners that are said to have been petrified in Swedish custom. There is the long sweeping curve of the glass, the courtly smile, the vertical descent of the glass in a military gesture to the second button of the host's waistcoat, or, if he be an officer, to the third button. And everyone at the table pronounces in uni-

son, joyously, the word of welcome: *skaal!* The Dane behaves in quite a different way. A Danish host begins with an apology: "You know we have an old absurd custom which must seem ridiculous to you Americans. We always propose a health before we begin to eat." He takes up the glass in an apologetic fashion, almost spills the contents in the informality of his gesture, sips the liquor nonchalantly, then repeats in an undertone the traditional word.

The Danes are, by the above sign, more intimate and more humorous, and more informal than their neighbors and view the seriousness of life with a grimace. They lean more heavily on one another in acts of coöperation. They are more modest and self-effacing; in fact, the attribute of highest praise in Denmark is, "He is so unassuming." The Swedes are more formal, more polite, more military, more efficient, more punctual. The Norwegians are the most pronouncedly Scandinavian of all the Northmen, the most individualistic, the most imaginative, the most hardy, the most disputatious, the most austere.

In conclusion, there are perhaps four characteristics of our Scandinavian immigrants which we should recognize and seek to encourage when they come to our shores.

First, there is their love of bodily culture, a cult developed with equal enthusiasm by the Finns and the Czechs.

Second, there is their appreciation of art. Most educated Scandinavians can do five things associated with popular art, at least passably well: write a letter, play

an instrument, carry a tune, draw a sketch, illustrate a folk dance. The Scandinavian is not so facile and enthusiastic and unerring in matters of arts as the Slav or the Italian, nor has his group produced as many outstanding artists, but his respect for the undefinable things of the imagination is no less than that of his friends of Alpine or Mediterranean stock.

Third, in matters of science, the Scandinavian averages far above these other racial groups. It is said that every Swede is born a potential inventor.

Fourth and last, from his social background the Scandinavian brings experience in applied coöperation. Perhaps it is his very violent individualism which has necessitated the development of a technique which has built up team play with his neighbors. Particularly is this true of the Danes, whose coöperative agriculture and trade unionism have been developed on a national scale and operated smoothly, as it were, with social ball-bearings.

The people who bring with them to us such potential racial assets surely deserve a careful reception. It would be a pity to allow this group to imitate, in the first generation, merely the excrescences of that nervous American life which craves slang, jazz, chewing gum, mileage, tabloids, and the movies. Let us think twice before hurrying them into the melting pot. Surely we should not criticize them too severely for remaining among us for one or two generations in segregated groups where they can set up again their own cultural environment and learn to adapt it slowly to the life of the New World.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Leach, Henry Goddard, *Scandinavia of the Scandinavians*, 1916
What You See in Sweden, 122 Illustrations, with Introductory Text by Borje Brilioth. The American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1924
- What You See in Norway, 121 Illustrations, with Introductory Text by Ben Blessum. The American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1924
- What You See in Denmark, 116 Illustrations, with Introductory Text by Ivar Kirkegaard. The American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1924

CHAPTER XVI

OTHER PEOPLES

By READ LEWIS,

Director of the Foreign Language Information Service.

IMMIGRANTS have come to the United States from every land. To describe the background of each of them would be to picture the life and history of all the peoples throughout the world. That is out of the question within the limits of the present volume. In this last chapter it is possible to present briefly only the more important facts in regard to a number of the peoples who have not been discussed in the preceding pages. Some of these peoples represent great nations whose historic achievements and contemporary culture are widely known. Others come from remote territories which are still something of a mystery in our western world.

None of the peoples to be included in the present chapter have in recent years sent any large number of immigrants to the United States, in comparison, at least, with most of the nations already discussed. According to the statistics of the Bureau of Immigration and the last United States Census—figures which are frequently questioned by the groups themselves—only four of the eleven peoples to be described in the following pages

have more than one hundred thousand immigrants in this country. The French, Dutch, and Swiss have each a little more or less than one hundred and fifty thousand, the Portuguese about one hundred. Two, the Albanians and the Turks, hardly number ten thousand. The others range between fifty-five and seventy thousand.

As one reads the history of the nations from which our immigrants—from which all of us but a few generations ago—have come, one realizes that each of them is a blending of different peoples and racial stocks. To talk of a pure race is to talk of something that does not exist. This American experiment of ours is not so novel a thing as at first it seemed. Numberless times has there been a mingling and amalgamation of peoples. And yet there is something new about it after all. Never before, that we know of, has such an experiment gone forward on so vast a scale, and in so brief a time. Never before has a single country drawn people from every land and tongue. In other times and places the mingling and incorporation has usually been the result of invasion and conquest. Here there has been a voluntary coming together. Prompted, indeed, by different motives, yet there has been much of the pilgrim and pioneer in all our immigrants as they have set sail to find in some way a fuller life in the new world. There has never been anything quite like it before and there may never be again.

How will it all turn out? For an experiment it is fraught with both dangers and possibilities. Among peoples of such divergent backgrounds, will America be

able to discover and build on the humanity which is common to us all? This survey of other peoples may well counsel patience in seeking an answer which only time can give. We cannot expect in half a dozen years results which we see elsewhere have taken generations. Yet surely this very volume is an augury of success. For where else have those coming in touch with the newcomer to their shores set out to study and understand his backgrounds in order to be able to give him the best that their country had to offer and to encourage him to give his best to a common life. Certainly if such effort is successful we may confidently expect that America, drawing from the whole world, may in turn have something commensurate to give back.

THE ALBANIANS

Unlike most of other European peoples, the Albanians are a separate racial group, both physically and linguistically. They and their language are one of the eight or nine distinct branches of the Aryan family tree. While there has been some mixture with neighboring peoples, one of their chief distinctions is the determination with which they have preserved their original language, customs and traditions, and the virtual independence of their mountain stronghold on the shores of the Adriatic. A part of the Ottoman empire since the Moslems first overran the Balkan Peninsula in the fifteenth century, Turkish rule was never more than nominal. The Albanians proclaimed their independence in 1912. Today Albania is a republic and member of the

League of Nations, a country about the size of Vermont and with less than a million people.

Life in its mountain villages is primitive and difficult. Nearly everyone is engaged in agriculture and cattle raising. Each household attempts to produce most of the necessities of life. Industries are negligible. There are practically no railroads and few highways.

The tribal system in Albania recalls feudal Europe. Tribal and family feuds—especially between the Ghegs and Tosks—are common. Almost constant warfare has been waged against either a common foe or each other. The blood feud is an established usage and the duty of revenge a sacred tradition. The men have been warriors rather than workers. Under Turkish rule instruction in Albania was prohibited and education was almost non-existent. Schools are now established but illiteracy is still widely prevalent and superstition common. There is practically no literature in the Albanian language, which is written in both Latin and Greek characters with various supplementary letters. The majority of the people are Mohammedans; the Christians are chiefly Roman Catholics or members of the Greek Orthodox Church. In religious matters the Albanians are tolerant, and since the republic religious freedom has been decreed. Notwithstanding a certain fierce and lawless disposition, the typical Albanian is simple, brave and capable of devoted attachment, with a high ideal of hospitality. Women have at once been kept in strict subjection and treated with a certain respect.

THE ARMENIANS

The home of the Armenians is the high plateau and mountainous region—culminating in Mt. Ararat—south of the Caucasus and the Black Sea. Through its valleys run the roads that connect Persia and Mesopotamia with the fertile lands and protected harbors of Asia Minor. A doorway between east and west, it is no wonder that from earliest times nations have contended for its possession. Despite invasion and persecution the majority of Armenians have continued to live in this land of their fathers. Its rugged mountains have always sheltered a part of the people and served as a refuge to which the lowlanders fled for safety in time of invasion.

Although the point has been recently raised in several naturalization cases, the Armenians belong beyond question to the white race, the nation having come into existence in the seventh century B.C. when the earlier inhabitants of the region were conquered by an Aryan people who imposed their speech. Armenian is one of the Indo-European languages. To the purely Armenian words have been added a large number of expressions from the Persian—a reminder of the early centuries when Persian influence was dominant. The present Armenian alphabet was invented at the beginning of the fifth century, following the conversion of Armenia to Christianity. Most Armenians today are members of the Armenian National Apostolic Church.

As a Christian kingdom in the midst of Moslem states, frequently overrun by nomad tribes, Armenia

had a stormy existence. It was conquered by the Mohammedans in 1375, and from 1514 was under Turkish rule, smaller parts of the Armenian territories being divided between Russia and Persia. It was to escape the despotism of Turkish rule that many Armenian immigrants have come to the United States. Those who came before 1894 were mostly students and merchants. Those who came from 1894 up to the Turkish Revolution of 1908 were chiefly refugees. Low wages and the poverty and backwardness of the country have also been an important factor in the increased immigration since 1908. Since 1920 Armenia, much reduced in area, has been a republic, a member of the Russian Union of Soviet, Socialist Republics. Only about one-third of the three million Armenians live within its borders.

Among modern Armenians, there is great difference between the townsmen and the people of the villages. Life in the latter is isolated and primitive. Large families and the patriarchal system prevail. The Armenian peasant may be a good cultivator of the soil but he is generally poor, superstitious, uneducated, and lacking in ambition. In the towns the Armenians, in spite of discouragement and opposition from the Turkish government, have maintained their own schools, usually connected with their churches. Many of the townsmen have been skilled artisans, bankers and merchants, noted for their industry, frugality, quick intelligence, enterprise, sober self-reliance and aptitude for business. Their shrewdness and ability to turn a good bargain have not made it easier to maintain friendly relations

with their Moslem neighbors. Strongly attached to old manners and customs, the Armenians have had a sturdiness of character which has enabled them to preserve their nationality and religion, and a faculty of adaptation to circumstances which has been an asset as they have emigrated to other lands.

THE BELGIANS

Although Belgium came into existence as an independent kingdom only in 1830, the name has been used ever since the time of Caesar to designate the people of the south Netherlands. The term Belgian has, however, no significance as to physical race or language and as used today means simply a native or inhabitant of Belgium. The Belgian nation is represented by two distinct linguistic stocks, the Flemings and Walloons. The Flemings are a Teutonic people, living on the plains and coastlands to the north and west and adjoining Holland. They speak Flemish, a language which closely resembles Dutch. The Walloons are descendants of the old Gallic Belgae or Celtic people and occupy the uplands in the southeastern provinces bordering on France. They speak French or Walloon. The latter, while not derived from French, is one of the old Romance languages which has practically been absorbed by French. Both French and Flemish are today official languages, Flemish having been declared such in 1898. All educated Flemings speak French, while few Walloons know Flemish. French has therefore been both politically and socially the more important language—

a fact which has given rise to a certain unrest and produced a Flemish movement.

The two peoples differ also in their chief occupations. The Flemings are characteristically tenant farmers. Owing to the nature of their country they excel in agriculture, horticulture and cattle breeding, and are prominent in the manufacture of textiles, especially linen and laces, rugs, in diamond cutting and cigar making, and in commerce. The important market of Antwerp with its great port lies in Flemish territory. The Walloons are small proprietary farmers, miners and manufacturers. They have in their section very important coal mines and have therefore tended to excel in metallurgy and industry. Their chief manufactures include steel products of all kinds, cutlery, arms and ammunition, automobiles, glass works, earthenware, and woolen goods. Most of the Belgian immigrants to the United States have been Flemish. Both Flemings and Walloons are almost all Roman Catholics.

Belgium is not quite as large as Maryland and has nearly eight million people—the most densely settled country in Europe. It has been a constitutional monarchy since it separated from Holland in 1830. Before then it had been successively under the domination of the Romans, Franks, House of Burgundy, Austrians, Spaniards, French and Dutch. Members of both the national Senate and Chamber are elected by manhood suffrage and proportional representation. Women have only municipal suffrage. Education is compulsory but despite widespread schools and a number of famous universities—Ghent, Liège, Brussels, Louvain—there is

still not a little illiteracy in the country. Belgian literature is important and modern writers include such famous names as Maurice Maeterlinck and Emile Verhaeren. The universal reputation of the masters of the old Flemish school of painting is divided with the Belgian artists of today. The Belgian people are fond of literature, theatre and sports. Their activity in industry and business enterprise are matched by an aptitude for the sciences and fine arts. The typical Belgian has a real love for work, order and freedom.

THE DUTCH

The sturdy valor and heroic resistance of the Dutch people have been exemplified both in their struggle for religious freedom and political independence and in their age-long fight against the sea. The Netherlands, as their country is officially called, fronts the North Sea. Many of its lowlands are below sea level and only an elaborate barrier of dunes and dikes keeps them from being submerged. River dikes, too, are often necessary. The typical Dutch landscape shows an expanse of rich meadowland, carefully drained by canals, bordered with willows, and dotted with windmills, sails of canal craft and clumps of elm and poplar surrounding the neat farm houses. In area the country is only the size of Maryland, but with its 7,500,000 people it is densely settled. South and North Holland, two of the eleven provinces into which The Netherlands are now divided, once formed the county which still gives the country its popular name.

The Dutch are of Low German origin, being descended from three branches of that Teutonic stock—Frankish, Saxon and Frisian. Dutch, the literary and national language of Holland, is derived from Old Saxon. One or two dialects were formerly common, principally Frisian, but this exists today only as a patois in the province of Friesland and on some of the islands off the coast.

The Germanic tribes from which the Dutch are derived, although at one time under Roman rule, were never really incorporated in the Empire. The feudal counties and municipalities which grew up in what is now Holland and Belgium quarrelled and flourished as a part of the Holy Roman Empire, and subsequently fell under the dominion of the House of Burgundy and in turn Austria and Spain. It was Philip II of Spain whose harsh and bloody efforts to crush the growth of Protestantism, roused The Netherlands to revolt under William of Orange. Like Washington, whom he resembled, William seemed to lose every battle and yet was never conquered. In 1581 the provinces declared themselves independent, but it was not until 1648 that Spain recognized the independence of the Dutch Republic.

At that time Holland was at the height of its prosperity, commercially and intellectually one of the most important countries in Europe. The ships that went out from Amsterdam and Rotterdam were the best in the world. The Dutch had established important colonies in both hemispheres and challenged England's supremacy on the seas. At home Rembrandt, Hals and

others of the Dutch School were painting their masterpieces. With its free press Holland had become a conspicuous refuge for men of letters and thinkers and the persecuted of other lands. In 1620 the Pilgrims set sail from its shores for the new world. Later the country was conquered and annexed by the French, but with the downfall of Napoleon, the Kingdom of The Netherlands, from which Belgium seceded in 1830, was established.

Holland is a constitutional monarchy in which parliament, the States General, is elected by the votes of both men and women over twenty-five and according to proportional representation. Education is compulsory from 7 to 13. With a highly developed school system there is only a very small percentage of illiteracy. About three-fifths of the people are Protestants, most of these belonging to the Dutch Reformed Church. Nearly two-fifths are Roman Catholics. Church and State are separated. The people are strongly religious and the Dutch clergyman usually wields an especially important influence.

Among the most characteristic industries are agriculture and the raising of live stock. Success in farming is based on scrupulous cleanliness and attention to detail. The cultivation of tulips and other bulbs, oyster culture, diamond cutting, and the cigar industry are also typical among many varied occupations. In social customs the Dutch are more closely allied to the English than to the Germans. Like the former they have been great colonizers. In Holland the lines between social classes are far more strictly drawn than here. The typical

Dutch immigrant of today is usually an agricultural worker. Love of home life, order and comfort, hospitality, industry, frugality and respect for authority are all common traits.

THE FRENCH

Although France has sent more immigrants to the United States than any of the nations included in this chapter, the French are not an emigrating people. Those who have come here from its pleasant countryside, red-roofed villages, or busy cities, are only a tiny fraction of the 40,000,000 people who inhabit a land, which though only twice the size of Colorado, has played so significant a rôle in the history of our western world and in modern affairs. France, today, is a country of immigration, rather than emigration, and the large number of foreigners who seek admission to it have resulted in the adoption of a policy of restricted immigration, such as we are familiar with in the United States. The typical Frenchman is devoted to his country and proud of its history, present power and extensive culture. His emigration is to be explained not by any general causes, such as oppression or widespread poverty, so frequently the case with other peoples, but by individual and personal reasons.

The French nation has been formed of many different elements. Even within historic times there has been a blending of racial stocks and there are still evident at least three distinct ethnic types. Caesar found the territories which were later to become France, occupied by

the Celts or Gauls. After their defeat at his hands, it became for several centuries one of the principal centers of Roman civilization. Under the latter Christianity was early introduced. By the beginning of the fifth century the Germanic invasions threatened the Empire and the advent of the Goths, Vandals, Visigoths, Burgundians, Franks and other Teutonic tribes profoundly affected both the people and their civilization. It was after the disruption of Charlemagne's Empire, and the several centuries of feudal anarchy that succeeded it that France finally emerged as an independent kingdom and national state. The French monarchs were engaged in two great struggles, to establish their supremacy over their own vassals and to defeat the century long efforts of the English kings to retain their foothold on the continent. The wars of religion came to an end with the Edict of Nantes (1598) with its proclamation of religious tolerance for France. Under Richelieu and Louis XIV was built up the absolute monarchy whose downfall came with the French Revolution. This far-reaching event represented the first attempt to formulate principles of human freedom and political equality, and its profound effects in doing away with old habits and institutions are matters of common knowledge. The administrative system of local government established by Napoleon has been effective and permanent, though during the past century the national government has shifted from monarchy to empire and republic. The Third Republic, however, proclaimed in 1871, has triumphantly survived all the crises of the last half century.

It is still common to think of Paris, the center of European culture, with its cosmopolitan population, gay boulevards, historic monuments and splendid vistas, as France. But the majority of Frenchmen are still attached to the soil. The French farm is usually very small and intensive cultivation is the rule. Wheat is the most important product. In southern France there are vast areas covered with grapes and olive trees. There are many rich pastoral regions. The French peasant is passionately devoted to his little plot of ground and tills it with the greatest care. It is his life, and many families of peasants have been on the same farm for generations. While the modern reaper and binder are known, one can still find farms in France, where the grain is threshed with a flail and the grass is mowed with a scythe. A middle-class Frenchman saves a little money every year and invests it in government bonds or some other first class security. He is not interested in amassing a fortune but in the day when the income from those securities will permit him to retire to a modest home in the village or country and enjoy life.

Although the ancient provinces of France, such as Brittany, Normandy, Burgundy, were officially abolished at the time of the Revolution, Frenchmen still refer to them. Differences of speech are still to be found, especially between the north and the south. It is the "langue d'oïl" of the north, not the Provençal of the south, which has become modern literary French. One of the Romance tongues, French is today used internationally; no modern language has ever rivalled it

in elegance and precision. In France all children from six to thirteen years of age are compelled to attend school. There is a very small degree of illiteracy. The vast majority of Frenchmen are Roman Catholics. After a long struggle the final separation of church and state was decreed in 1905. The modern Frenchman has participated in electoral campaigns since 1870. French politics, as contrasted with our own, are marked by more intense feeling and by many small parties instead of our two-party system.

The list of distinguished names which French genius has contributed to literature, philosophy, drama, criticism, science, music and art, is too long to enumerate. Rabelais, Montaigne, Calvin, Racine, Molière, Descartes, Voltaire, Rousseau, Victor Hugo, Balzac, Dumas, Anatole France, Pasteur, Saint-Saëns, Debussy, Rodin, Cezanne, are household words throughout the world. The French invented Gothic architecture, and their cathedrals are the most beautiful in the world. Their leadership in the elaboration of socialistic theory and their initiative in the radical movements in modern painting and music suggest the stimulus and cosmopolitanism of Paris rather than the essentially conservative character of the country. For France is compounded of many things: the gay, brilliant and emotional temperament inherited from the Celts, the logical and organizing faculties derived from Roman ancestry, the industry, frugality and love of the soil natural in an agricultural people all go to make up the national character.

THE PORTUGUESE

Despite the vividness of the Portuguese landscape, its variety of mountain, moorland and forest, its brilliant sunshine, rich flora and gaily colored houses, living conditions in Portugal are difficult, and the poverty among the peasantry and laboring classes is often widespread and extreme. With primitive methods of agriculture and undeveloped industries Portugal is not able to furnish sufficient economic opportunities for its relatively dense population. It is not surprising to find therefore that each year a large number of its people follow in the footsteps of those Portuguese discoverers who in the sixteenth century made their country one of the greatest maritime and colonial powers in Europe. The immigrants of today come chiefly from the sober, hardy and industrious peasantry of the northern provinces and the Azores and go for the most part to Brazil, to which important nation the Portuguese have given their language.

Comparatively homogeneous though they are today, the Portuguese are composed of many racial elements. Their earliest known ancestors were the Iberians. The Romans who ruled the Iberian Peninsula for six centuries gave Portugal its language. The Suevic and Visigothic conquests left even a more permanent impress. After 711 came the long period of Moorish rule. About 1450 a large number of negro slaves were imported from Africa and their subsequent intermarriage introduced still a further element. The Portuguese language, as already suggested, is one of the Romance

tongues, both it and Spanish being derived from the Latin once spoken throughout the Peninsula.

In the course of the Christian reconquest of the Peninsula from the Moors Portugal emerged at the beginning of the twelfth century as an independent kingdom. Today, including the Azores and Madeira Islands, Portugal is only a little smaller than Indiana and has some 6,000,000 people. Constitutional government was established in 1826. The republic proclaimed in 1910 has had a somewhat precarious existence. Illiterates were deprived of the franchise in 1919. This excludes the greater part of the population since some seventy per cent of the people are illiterate despite a law making education compulsory. Most Portuguese are Roman Catholics. The republican government has effected the separation of church and state.

About three-fifths of the people are engaged in agriculture. Vineyards are found throughout the country. Except in northern Portugal the land is chiefly in the form of large estates and the mass of the population are employed as tenant farmers or farm hands. Primitive farm implements, familiar to the Romans, are often still in use. Wages are very low and women as well as men work in the fields and quarries or at the docks. There are extensive fisheries, the Portuguese being skilful seamen. The few manufacturers include textiles, laces and embroideries, pottery and porcelains—some of them reminiscent of artistic handicrafts introduced by the Moors.

The typical Portuguese peasant is characterized by a quiet determination, industry, brave endurance of hard-

ship, and a persistent looking for better things. He is devout, though religion and recreation frequently go hand in hand as illustrated in the *romarias*, a combination of religious pilgrimage and country fair, popular throughout the country. He is superstitious, and often depends on magic and charms in case of illness. Courteous hospitality, good temper, quiet thoughtfulness and a certain wistful melancholy are equally notable. Amid living conditions which are generally difficult and often squalid, the Portuguese peasantry exhibit an artistic sense manifest in their love of music, their improvisation of poetry, and in their native costumes and handicrafts.

THE ROUMANIANS

Although the Roumanians are numerically the largest people in southeastern Europe (excluding Russia) they have sent comparatively few immigrants to the United States. Roumania has doubled its territory since the War and is now about the size of New Mexico or the British Isles with a population of 18,000,000. The Roumanians are exceptional in being linguistically of one affiliation and physically of another. The Roman soldiers who settled on the Danube in the second century gave their speech to the Dacians whom they conquered and from whom the Roumanians are descended. The Roman element was an important one and its effects are still visible in the sympathies between the people of Roumania and the Latin nations. But its history and civilization have allied Roumania with the Balkan peninsula.

The language of the Roumanians belongs to the Romance tongues, and now employs the Roman alphabet. The words in most common use are of Latin origin, though two-fifths are Slavic and there are also many Turkish, Hungarian and German expressions. The language, like their music, reflects the vicissitudes of their history. In religion the Roumanians belong to the eastern branch of Christianity, the Orthodox Church. Their government is a constitutional monarchy. Both the upper and lower houses of parliament are elected (since 1917) by manhood suffrage. Women are permitted a voice only in municipal affairs. Trial by jury is guaranteed by the constitution.

Primary education is compulsory wherever there are schools. Although the amount of illiteracy is decreasing, there is still much superstition among the peasant class. Their villages from the Carpathian Mountains to the Black Sea reflect primitive standards of comfort. The Roumanian peasants are responsible for one of the richest folklores in eastern Europe; their music, plaintive pastorals and ballads are full of color, feeling and pathos; their national costume, woven by peasant women, is beautiful in color combination and delicacy of texture. Every home, as a rule, has its ikon or sacred picture. Church festivals and fasts are kept with equal care. In customs and traditions they show both their Latin and their Slavic origin.

More than 80 per cent of the Roumanians are engaged in agriculture, lumbering and fishing. Its bounteous fields have made Roumania one of the important grain-growing countries of the world. The land re-

form which went into effect immediately after the War, made for a more liberal distribution of the agricultural lands and spurred the peasants toward a higher standard of living and a keener desire for education. Almost all of the Roumanian immigrants coming to the United States are of peasant stock, hard workers, thrifty and quiet. The Jewish immigrants from Roumania are chiefly tradesmen, merchants or skilled laborers.

THE SPANISH

Fewer than one-twelfth of the Spanish-speaking immigrants in the United States come from Spain. For a long period the Spanish were an important emigrating and colonizing people. The fact that Spanish is the language of Mexico and most of Central and South America is a reminder of Spain's voyages of discovery and her one-time extended possessions in the New World. Today Spain's comparatively few emigrants naturally go, for the most part, to Spanish-speaking countries.

The typical Spaniard is a proud man. No doubt he inherits his pride from the Moors and Berbers who in 711 invaded his country and lived there for about seven centuries, and his cool precision and courage from the Romans who for six centuries before the Moorish invasion counted Spain as one of their most valuable possessions. The vividness of the Spanish disposition is perhaps in part explained by this varied ancestry.

The whole kingdom of Spain is about two-thirds the

size of the State of Texas, yet the Spanish people—the present population is about 23,000,000—are possessed of such diverse temperaments and interests that they pursue almost every type of occupation. In the small villages along the northern coast, for instance, fishing is the age-old means of acquiring a livelihood. Farther inland grazing and grain lands have lured many thrifty farmers. The great central region is a rich grain and grape-growing country; here the dignified, somewhat austere and sensitive Castilian lives. Further south great quantities of fruit and olives are grown, until finally along the coast of the Mediterranean vegetation grows in tropical abundance. This southern land shelters the amiable laughter-loving southern Spaniard. His sunny temper and unruffled serenity no doubt reflect the smiling land he lives in, as the more austere Castilian reflects his rugged surroundings.

In spite of occupational diversities, however, the people of Spain as an ethnic group present today a remarkable unity. They are descended from the ancient Celt-Iberians, with a considerable infusion of other stocks, including even Teutonic elements dating from the occupation by the Visigoths. The national language, one of the Romance tongues, is even more closely related to Latin than Italian. Spanish is not the only native language; Basque and Catalan, however, are spoken by comparatively small groups in the Pyrenees and on the East Coast.

Spain is a monarchy, the king and his ministers being responsible to the Cortes. Constitutional government, however, has suffered many vicissitudes and in recent

years has been frequently abrogated by some military leader who has been able to seize dictatorial powers. Although schools are increasing the majority of Spaniards are still illiterate. This condition is in sharp contrast to Spain's rich cultural backgrounds, its high intellectual standards and the many outstanding names—Cervantes, Calderon, Velasquez, Sorolla, Benavente, Ibanez, Concha Espina, Zuolaga, to mention only a few—which Spanish genius has contributed to world literature and art. Most Spaniards are devout Catholics and their splendid old cathedrals suggest the important part the church has played in the life of the country. Roman Catholicism is the established religion and the Church and the clergy are maintained by the State.

The typical Spaniard has an intense pride in his country and is passionately devoted to his home. Although he may be desperately poor and lack the advantages of a formal education, he is usually alert, sensitive, with a yearning towards refinement which suggests the ancient culture of his country.

THE SWISS

Unlike the names of other peoples, "Swiss" has no significance as to race, language or religion; it denotes simply a native or inhabitant of Switzerland. The Swiss are represented by four linguistic groups, one Teutonic (German) and three (French, Italian and Romansch) belonging to the Romance tongues. German is spoken in the North and East by 71 per cent of the whole

Swiss population, French in the West by 22 per cent, and Italian in the South by 6 per cent. Romansch, an independent neo-Latin language, is spoken by 40,000 in the Canton of Grisons. The Swiss immigrants in the United States show a somewhat similar division; 82 per cent of them (in 1920) were German speaking, 11 per cent French and 6 per cent Italian. All three languages are recognized in Switzerland as official and as everybody understands at least two of them, all three are admitted for deliberations in the Federal Assembly.

The origin of Switzerland dates back to 1291, when the inhabitants of the mountain valleys surrounding the Lake of Lucerne declared their independence. A strong desire for freedom prompted them to this united action, and sympathizers were soon found in the adjoining communities. The territory grew, and all armed expeditions of the reigning dynasties of the neighboring countries to put an end to that movement were crushed by the valiant Helvetians. Until 1798 the Confederation was composed of German-speaking districts. Each community that joined retained its autonomy, thereby preserving its traditions, language and religion.

At the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the 22 Cantons or states comprising Switzerland were recognized and their perpetual neutrality guaranteed by the Powers; but the Confederation was only definitely established, after a short civil war, in 1848 by the adoption of the Constitution, certain characteristics of which were taken from the United States. It provides, for example, for a Federal Assembly with two Houses, one being the

Council of States with two delegates from each Canton and the other the National Council representing the people at large with one delegate to each 30,000 of the population. The President of the Confederation serves for one year.

Switzerland has an area of 16,000 square miles—a little smaller than New Hampshire and Vermont and a population of approximately 4,000,000. Due to its unexcelled scenery—snow-capped mountains, fir forests, famous lakes, beautiful valleys and clean, picturesque villages—Switzerland is each year the goal of many thousands of tourists. Seventy-seven per cent of the land is productive, 23 per cent being covered by mountains and lakes. The dairy industry flourishes. Lacking the most essential natural resources, the Swiss are largely engaged in manufacturing products of high quality which are exported, the chief commodities being watches, clocks, textiles, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, cheese, milk, chocolate, machinery, aluminum and straw goods. Raw materials are imported. On account of lack of coal, the water power with which Switzerland abounds has been highly developed and the railroads, which are mostly owned by the Federal Government, are to a large extent electrified.

Fifty-seven per cent of the Swiss people are Protestant, forty-two per cent Roman Catholic. Complete freedom of worship and speech are provided by the Constitution. Schools are highly developed. Education is compulsory between the ages of six and fourteen and there is practically no illiteracy.

THE SYRIANS

The Syrians in the United States have come from a region of great importance in the world's history—the country lying at the eastern end of the Mediterranean. From its borders the Phoenicians set sail and disseminated the alphabet from which our own is directly derived, and Palestine contributed Judaism and Christianity to the world. Many different nationalities have fought and settled here, lying as the country does close to one of the great trade routes of ancient times. Because theirs was a land where East met West either in war or in trade, the Syrians, being numerically small, have tended to become a peaceful rather than a bellicose people, sharp-witted, and more apt to seek redress of a wrong by diplomacy and suasion than by recourse to arms.

Physically the modern Syrians are of mixed Syrian, Arabian and even Jewish blood. They belong to the Semitic branch of the Caucasian or white race. During the time of Christ the spoken language of the country was Syro-Chaldean and it could still be found as the language of the home in some remote villages of the mountainous regions, such as Mt. Lebanon, famous for its cedars, up to less than a century ago. At different times other languages, following invasion and conquest of the country, have been common. Arabic, introduced when Syria was conquered by the Mohammedians in the seventh century, has prevailed ever since, ousting Aramaic (Syro-Chaldean) from common use

and resisting even the influence of the Turkish conquest which took place in 1516.

The bulk of the population in Syria—about three million—is Mohammedan, although in the region of Mt. Lebanon, on the Mediterranean littoral, Christianity prevails. All Syrians at one time were Christians, but except for the inhabitants of Lebanon embraced Islam following the Arab conquest. Most Syrian immigrants in the United States are Christians, and many have emigrated to escape religious persecution. The influence of American missionaries and schools in Syria has been an important one, especially in the spread of popular education.

Ever since the Turkish Revolution of 1908 the nationalist movement in Syria—and in the other Arabic-speaking provinces of the Turkish Empire—has been active. In 1920 it was strong enough to proclaim an independent Syrian kingdom, but this came to an end a few months later with the entry of French troops into Damascus. Today Syria is under a French mandate but the unrest continues. Palestine and Trans-jordan, formerly a part of Syria, have been detached and are under separate British mandates.

Industry in Syria is inconsequential. Immigrants from the cities are mostly small merchants and clerks, and those from the country farmers; in America both have turned to commercial pursuits, recalling thereby a trait of their Phoenician forbears. The home life of the Syrian is most simple and conventional and follows patriarchal lines. Reverence for their elders and re-

spect for women are common traits. Some usages and customs from biblical times still obtain.

THE TURKS

The Turks trace their origin to the same primitive Mongolian stock from which the Magyars, Finns and Japanese are derived. While the Turks, like the Finns and Magyars, have become so much Europeanized in blood that they are counted as belonging to the white race, their language is of absolutely different origin and type from our own. Like the other Ural-Altaic languages, Turkish is agglutinative as contracted with our Indo-European languages, which are inflected. As spoken today, Turkish includes many Arabic and Persian words. In the same way the people of Turkey have been hardly more Turkish by blood than Arabian, Circassian, Persian, Armenian, Greek and Slavic. Indeed in no country is the folly of trying to make clear definitions of race more apparent. In religion, however, they are almost universally Mohammedans, and this explains why so few Turkish immigrants have found their way to the United States.

Until the revolution of the Young Turks in 1908 Turkey had been an absolute monarchy, the sultan having been temporally supreme and also the spiritual head of the Moslem world. In 1922 the nationalist government which had been set up at Angora two years before declared itself sovereign of Turkey and abolished the sultanate; thus bringing to an end an empire which had existed since the close of the thirteenth century and

which since 1453 had been ruled from Constantinople. The Turkish Republic was not formally proclaimed until the following year. As compared with the former Ottoman Empire the new republic has a greatly reduced but a far more homogeneous population—some six to eight million—many of its territories having been ceded, as a result of the wars in which Turkey was almost continuously engaged from 1911.

Despite much prejudice to the contrary, the Turk is tolerant and law abiding, honest and hospitable. The poverty of the country and the high degree of illiteracy are both obstacles in making its new and modern constitution effective. Turkey is essentially an agricultural country. While Mohammedan law has permitted polygamy, it has not been generally practiced or approved, and is now abolished by the Republic.

325.73133i

Immigrant backgrounds



1144 00089217 3

325.73

I33i

154683

Immigrant backgrounds.

325.73

I33i

154683

Immigrant backgrounds.

4 01 7

C. SHELTERS ANY
BOX 1571

12/2/87

mad

FDU

WITHDRAWN
DREW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
MADISON, NEW JERSEY 07940

← pocket is
inside
end paper

